DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 160 EA 016 257

TITLE	New Paths toward Research Leadership for Minorities and Women. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Mar 83
GRANT	NIE-G-79-0052
NOTE	103p.; Project No. A9-0133; research conducted between September 1979-December 1982.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Computer Science Education; Educational Opportunities; Educational Researchers; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Fellowships; Higher Education; Intercollegiate Cooperation; Interprofessional Relationship; *Leadership Training; Mentors; *Minority Groups; *Postdoctoral Education; Professional Development; *Racial Integration; Research and Development; *Sex Fairness; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS	Michigan State University; Morgan State University MD

ABSTRACT

This final report describes a federally funded program that identified and then provided 2 years of training for minorities and women who had completed a doctorate but were not currently active in educational research. Program participants were selected from the distinct populations of: faculty from Morgan State University, Maryland, a traditionally black institution; faculty from Michigan State University; and recent Ph.D. recipients recruited nationally. A total of 15 fellowships were awarded to 3 cohorts of postdoctoral fellows. The program's major strengths are cited as recruitment of promising candidates and their research collaboration with senior educational researchers, twice weekly research seminars, computer seminars, a visiting scholars program, support for attending national research conferences, and the conference held for participants in all three cohorts at the end of the 3 years of funding. The training program included a second year of "mentor-fellow" research collaboration that, for a variety of reasons, was evaluated as the weakest part of the program. The appendixes contain recruiting material, program evaluation statements by 12 of the 15 postdoctoral fellows, the postdoctoral miniconference agenda, and a directory of postdoctoral program participants. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238160

EA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NEW PATHS TOWARD RESEARCH LEADERSHIP
FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN
September 1979-December 1982

NIE-G-79-0052
Project #A9-0133

Institute for Research on Teaching

College of Education — Michigan State University

EA 016 257

NEW PATHS TOWARD RESEARCH LEADERSHIP FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN

September 1979-December 1982

NIE-G-79-0052
Project #A9-0133

Final Report
March 1983

Co-Directors
Jacquelyn R. Nickerson
Andrew C. Porter

Institute for Research on Teaching
Michigan State University

Abstract

New Paths Toward Research Leadership for Minorities and Women

This program was designed to provide effective strategies for increasing the number of minorities and women who are active members of the educational research and development community. The program consisted of three cohorts of participants. Each cohort included participants from three distinct populations: faculty from Morgan State University, a traditionally Black institution; faculty from Michigan State University; and recent Ph.D. recipients recruited nationally.

The first year of the training experience included reseach collaboration with an experienced educational researcher, a research seminar, visiting scholars, and formal course work. The emphasis was on active learning, taking into account each participant's existent knowledge about education and educational research. Technical writing skills were given high priority. Research fellows completed the year with improved research skills, an awareness of the complete educational research process, understanding of how their research interests fit within the broad area of educational research, and a plan for conducting an educational research study.

The training program included a second year of "mentor-fellow" research collaboration, thus insuring a continued relationship with an active educational researcher. Research fellows returning to faculty positions were intended to take on increasing responsibilities for educational research. In the case of recent Ph.D. recipients, every effort was made for placement in positions of high visibility and where productivity in educational research is expected.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Overview	4
Program Elements	5
Institutional Context of the Training Program	7
Michigan State University	7
Morgan State University	9
Recruitment of Post Doctoral Fellows	10
General Recruitment Procedures	11
Morgan State Recruitment	11
Financial Support for Post Doctoral Fellows	13
Post Doctoral Fellows in the Three Cohorts	13
Educational Training Experiences	16
The Mentor Component	16
Post Doctoral Research Seminar	19
Technical Writing	23
Computer Application Seminars	24
Coursework	26
Visiting Scholars	27
Conference Attendance and Research Site Visitation	32
Collegial Relationships	33
Program Evaluation	34
Quarterly Evaluations	34
Annual Evaluations	36
Evaluation at the End of Three Years	37
Collaboration with Morgan State University	38
Additional Program Activities	40
Inter-America Research Associates Case Study	40
Post Doctoral Mini-Conference	40
Where Post Doctoral Fellows are Now	41
1979-80 Cohort	41
1980-81 Cohort	42
1981-82 Cohort	43
Summary	44
Appendices	
A. Recruitment Materials	48
B. Evaluations by Post Doctoral Fellows	51
C. Post Doctoral Mini-Conference Agenda	89
D. Directory of Post Doctoral Program Participants	92

Overview

The post doctoral program for minorities and women in educational research titled "New Paths Toward Research Leadership" was funded by the National Institute of Education beginning September 1979 for a three year period. The program represented a collaborative effort between Michigan State University and Morgan State University. The three general goals of the program were:

1. To increase the number of minorities and women actively engaged in educational research and development,

2. To increase the quality and diversity of educational research through increased participation of minorities and women in the various educational research networks, and

3. To conduct an experiment to test alternative approaches for increasing participation of minorities and women in educational research.

These general goals were translated into specific objectives for the program's major "stakeholders:" the individual participants, Michigan State University, Morgan State University, and the educational research community at large.

1. Individual Participants: The objectives were to (a) provide an opportunity in educational research both for individuals who have an established role at a major univerity, and for new Ph.D's who are seeking to become more visible in a competitive job market; (b) provide an opportunity for these individuals to upgrade and use research skills pursuant to their research interests; (c) provide an opportunity for exposure to and assimilation in the research network.

2. Michigan State University: The objectives were to (a) facilitate and expedite the institutional renewal already underway; (b) encourage and support greater participation of minorities and women in institutionally-based research; (c) demonstrate in a programmatic way the institution's commitment to affirmative action and equal opportunity; (d) become more knowledgeable about institutional changes required to facilitate training of minorities and women in research.

3. Morgan State University: The objectives were to (a) facilitate the faculty development necessary to transform the institution

from an undergraduate college to a major graduate and undergraduate university; (b) provide research faculty who will serve as role models for graduate students; (c) increase the level of research and development productivity; (d) provide faculty support for the new Urban Research Institute.

4. Educational Research Community: The objectives were to (a) add to the limited number of minorities and women actively engaged in educational research; (b) broaden the research areas being addressed, especially the areas of concern to minorities and women; (c) gain insight into mid-career training models that may prove successful and can be promoted by the educational research community for its own renewal now and in the future.

Program Elements

The program called for the identification and recruitment of minorities and women currently holding Ph.D. or equivalent degrees in education or a related area and who had an interest in becoming educational researchers. The candidates were recruited from three populations: Morgan State University faculty, Michigan State University faculty, and recent Ph.D. recipients from the nation at large.

Because of reduced funding, the size of each cohort was too small to conduct the originally designed experiment for the three populations of program participants. Three cohorts of five post doctoral fellows participated in the program. The first two cohorts have completed their year in residence at Michigan State University and a second year of continued research collaboration. The third cohort is now completing the second year of research collaboration.

The first cohort was comprised of two fellows from Michigan State and three selected from national recruitment. The second cohort was comprised of one fellow from Michigan State, two from Morgan State, and two fellows from the nationwide recruitment. The final cohort included two fellows from Michigan State, one fellow from Morgan State, and two participants from national recruitment.

Selected candidates were invited to participate as research fellows in a two-year program of advanced study in educational research. The program was housed in Michigan State University's College of Education under the administrative auspices of the Institute for Research on Teaching. A research fellow's first year was spent full time in residence obtaining direct experience in all aspects of conducting educational research. The year of residence included research collaboration with a senior educational researcher, twice weekly research seminars, a visiting scholars program, seminars on computer applications, and formal course work. Within this format, consideration was given to individual participant's strengths and weaknesses in regard to educational research. Throughout the program, high priority was placed on the preparation of publishable manuscripts reporting educational research.

Mentors for research collaboration were selected with mutual consent from a pool of senior researchers at Michigan State University and Morgan State University. The mentors represented expertise in a variety of substantive and methodological areas of research. Research collaboration with a mentor allowed the participants to (1) review and critique research underway, (2) participate in the conduct of research studies, and most importantly (3) plan and begin to implement new research studies of particular interest to the individual participant.

The "mentor-fellow" relationship was seen as a collegial one which was intended to extend well beyond the years of the program. To that end, the program made provision for one year of continued collaboration between the fellows and their mentors. It was envisioned that the mentor would visit the participant's institution and continue to provide

consultation, conduct seminars, and engage in other activities consistent with the program goals.

Institutional Context of the Training Program

The advanced training program involved two major institutions of higher education, Michigan State University and Morgan State University. The program of advanced study complimented major institutional renewal programs currently underway at both institutions. A brief description of the two institutions and their respective renewal efforts will serve to place the training program in context.

Michigan State University

As a land-grant university, Michigan State has always been concerned with extending the benefits of education and educational inquiry to those most likely to profit from the inquiry. Historically, Michigan State has had an attitude of institutional flexibility that allows its individual components to work together in addressing broad, encompassing issues. One such issue, educational equity, has been a longstanding institutional priority. In 1972, Michigan State University established the College of Urban Development, one of the first such colleges at a major institution. The mission of the College of Urban Development, now the Urban Affairs Program, is to address major problem areas particular to an urbanized society, including the problems facing urban education. The College of Urban Development has been instrumental in attracting minority educators not only to its own faculty but to faculties of the other colleges in the university.

Michigan State's College of Education is responding to the new demands of contemporary higher education through a variety of internal

changes which redirect the emphasis from preservice teacher training programs to resesarch and development. The college continues to offer a broad range of doctoral and master's level degree options and continues to engage in a number of experimental teacher training projects.

Another major research effort within the College of Education is the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT), established in 1976. The IRT was the first research center founded by the National Institute for Education since the federal agency was created by Congress in 1972. The IRT is charged with three major missions: (1) to conduct a program of research on teaching, thought, and action, including both causal and consequent factors; (2) to offer research training and thus prepare new scholars to engage in this important area of inquiry; and (3) to serve as a communication center for the documentation and deliberation on national and international research on teaching. As stated earlier, the IRT served as the administrative home for the post doctoral program.

Now in its seventh year of operation, the IRT is seriously attempting to address problems and issues ignored by earlier research efforts, while maintaining close contact with other research centers pursuing valuable work in this field. Current investigations of teaching are characterized by complex research paradigms, sophisticated methods of inquiry, and a great diversity of professionals cooperating in the research process. In addition to its programs of research, the IRT has a number of other features which enhanced the training program. The features include: collaboration between researchers and teachers, interdisciplinary staff, and orientation toward practical problems.

Morgan State University

Morgan State University was founded in 1867. Originally under the auspices of the Methodist Church, Morgan State University is committed to serving the needs of Black Americans. In this tradition, Morgan has developed a distinguished reputation as a liberal arts college. More recently, Morgan has evolved into a modern urban institution with a distinctly cosmopolitan and heterogeneous student body. As one of the institutions included in the Maryland State College system, Morgan State was elevated to university status in 1975 by the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges of Maryland. As a member of Maryland's university system, Morgan State University has the approval and support of the Maryland State Board of Higher Education for development of doctoral level education. Specifically, Morgan State University is under a mandate to develop graduate and professional programs which emphasize an urban orientation.

The faculty and administration of Morgan State represent a multicultural, ethnically and educationally diverse group. The faculty and adminstration have been actively involved in evaluating existing institutional strengths and capabilities and identifying areas where further development will be necessary to fully realize Morgan State's potential as a graduate level, urban-oriented university. As part of its overall institutional development plan, Morgan State University has received financial support for an Institute for Urban Research. The central mission of the Institute for Urban Research is to focus on urban problems by providing the environment, facilities, and staff support that will foster the development of sophisticated research agendas.

This university-wide institute is administratively housed in the School of Graduate Studies. The organizational structure encourages participation by the faculties of all the schools of the university. It provides important linkages with municipal, county, state, and federal agencies, community groups and institutions, as well as private foundations and other educational institutions.

The Institute for Urban Research is developing programs of research that include inquiries in the natural sciences, social sciences, and education. The Institute is staffed by recognized researchers recruited to Morgan State University and current faculty members.

In sum, the program for minorities and women represented a natural and attractive extension of institutional renewal and development programs already underway at both Morgan and Michigan State Universities. The current developmental efforts at both institutions emphasize increased research and development productivity, including visible institutional units for research and development, and provide support systems which encourage and reward individual researchers. In addition, both institutions agreed to release faculty for participation in the program and to provide some salary support during the year of study.

Recruitment of Post Doctoral Fellows

General Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment activities were conducted by the program co-directors for all three cohorts of post doctoral fellows. Candidates were sought for the post doctoral fellowship from the three target populations: Michigan State University, Morgan State University, and nationwide.

Recruitment activities over the three year period were similar in respect to Michigan State and the nationwide populations. These activities included:

1. advertising in the Chronicle of Higher Education, briefly describing the program and the deadline for applications;
2. sending a letter to the dean of each college at Michigan State University indicating the nature of the program and asking for help in identification of interested faculty;
3. directly mailing a program brochure to minorities in higher education across the nation (this mailing list was secured from Robert Green, Dean of the Urban Affairs Program at MSU);
4. advertising in the MSU College of Education newsletter;
5. sending brochures to each member of the MSU Black Faculty Association; and
6. advertising in the MSU News Bulletin.

Individuals interested in applying for the post doctoral program were to provide a curriculum vitae; a personal statement including (a) career goals, (b) areas of research interest, (c) types of training or research experience desired; and at least three letters from individuals qualified to comment on their potential for the program. For each of the three years of recruitment, approximately 65 complete applications were submitted from the nationwide recruitment. From Michigan State faculty, six applications were received for each of the first two years and twelve for the final year.

Morgan State Recruitment

Special recruitment activities were carried out for the Morgan State faculty. During the first year Dr. Zolla Boone, Director of Curriculum at Morgan State, served as the Morgan State program coordinator. Dr. Boone visited Michigan State to confer with the program co-directors, and the co-directors visited Morgan State to

talk with interested faculty. For a variety of reasons, however, including staff replacements, faculty personal commitments, and administrative arrangements, no faculty were identified for participation in the first year.

Because of the difficulties experienced in recruiting Morgan State faculty, a special orientation program was designed to facilitate recruitment for the second cohort. During the spring of 1979, four Morgan State faculty visited the Michigan State campus to become acquainted with the program. The one-week orientation included special research seminars, a tour of campus facilities, a colloquium with visiting scholar Dr. Edgar Epps of the University of Chicago, and a social gathering with fellows in the first cohort. The orientation was a success, and two of the four Morgan State visitors ultimately participated in the program as members of the second cohort.

Recruitment at Morgan State for the third cohort was coordinated by Dr. Clara Adams, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Dr. Phil Carey, Director of the Urban Institute. Dr. Jane Enty was selected and joined the program's third cohort.

In reviewing recruitment procedures at Morgan State several factors became evident. First, the contact person for recruitment activities must be a member of the administrative unit of the institution. This facilitates communication with deans and directors of the various university units regarding negotiations for faculty leave, replacements, and financial arrangements. Second, personal interviews of faculty and visits by the program co-directors are necessary to promote interest on the part of adminstrative staff and faculty. Third, there must be

recognition of distance and time factors in terms of relocation. This prompted budgetary provisions for two return home trips for Morgan State participants.

Financial Support for Post Doctoral Fellows

Morgan State and Michigan State faculty received their regular salaries during participation in the program. To partially offset university costs, Michigan State received $10,000 for one participating faculty member in each cohort and Morgan State received $14,000 for each of its participating faculty. Participants from the nation-at-large did not have institutional sponsors and each received a one-year fellowship in the amount of $12,000.

Each cohort was to include two Morgan State faculty, one Michigan State faculty, and one fellow from the nation-at-large. As has been described, for a variety of reasons the composition of each cohort differed somewhat from the design. In the first and third cohorts, Michigan State provided support for an additional faculty member's participation who met selection criteria. Further, each year of recruitment, top applicants from the nation-at-large were invited to join the program but without benefit of a fellowship. In the second cohort, one person accepted this invitation.

Post Doctoral Fellows in the Three Cohorts

First cohort fellows (1979-81) included three nationwide applicants since no Morgan faculty were identified for participation. Dr. Hakim Rashid received his doctorate in educational psychology from the University of Michigan in 1976. He was an assistant professor of human development in the School of Human Ecology at Howard University. Dr.

Jacqueline Reed received her doctorate from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in 1978 with a specialization in counseling. Dr. Reed left an administrative position at the University of Wisconsin placement office to become a full-time post doctoral fellow in the program. Dr. Martha Warfield received her doctorate in 1979 from Michigan State University in the area of counseling and was on the faculty at Kalamazoo Valley Community College.

The Michigan State University applicant selected was Dr. Jacqueline Caul, who received her doctorate from Michigan State University with a specialization in secondary administration and higher education. At the time of her selection she was an assistant professor in the Division of Student Teaching and Professional Development. Michigan State also made possible the participation of Dr. Gordon Fooks. Dr. Fooks was an assistant professor in the Counseling, Personnel Services and Educational Psychology Department and received his doctorate from Pennsylvania State University in the area of vocational counseling.

Post doctoral fellows in the second cohort (1980-82) included two faculty from Morgan State University, one Michigan State faculty, and two from national recruitment (one without fellowship support). Dr. Stella Hargett, an assistant professor of Sociology at Morgan State University, received her doctorate in social psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Dr. Esther Ridley, chairperson of the comprehensive science and science education department at Morgan State University, received her doctorate in developmental physiology from Oklahoma State University. The Michigan State University participant was Dr. Lonnie McIntyre, associate

professor of curriculum and instruction. He received the doctorate in reading from Indiana University. Dr. Joseph Price was selected from nationwide applicants to receive a fellowship for program participation. Dr. Price was an assistant professor in social-emotional disorders at the University of Michigan where he also received his doctorate in 1974. Dr. Aban Daruwalla was also selected from nationwide applicants but participated in the program without benefit of fellowship. Dr. Daruwalla was an instructor in language and literature education at Shelby State Community College, Memphis, Tennessee, and received her doctorate in foundations of education from Memphis State University in 1979.

The third cohort of post doctoral fellows (1981-83) included one Morgan State faculty member, two from Michigan State and two from national recruitment. The Morgan State participant was Dr. Jane Enty, associate professor in the Department of Home Economics. Dr. Enty received her doctorate from the University of Pennsylvania. The Michigan State participant partially supported by the contract was Dr. Eugene Pernell, associate professor of special education. Dr. Pernell received his doctorate from the University of Michigan. A second Michigan State faculty participant was wholly supported by the university. Dr. Gretchen Barbatsis, assistant professor in the Department of Telecommunication, received her doctorate from the University of Minnesota. The two fellows selected from the national recruitment were Dr. John Newby and Dr. Flavio Vega. Dr. Newby received his doctorate from the University of Massachusetts in 1974 and was associate professor and assistant vice provost for Developmental Education at Bowling Green State University. Dr. Flavio Vega, Director of Human Relations

Education and Development Program, University of Iowa, received his doctorate in higher education administration from the University of Minnesota in 1978.

Thus, there were 15 post doctoral fellows across the three cohorts (see appendix D for current addresses). The composition of the cohorts included seven males and eight females. Of the males, six were black and one was chicano. The female participants included five blacks, two whites, and one East Indian. Morgan State University had three participants, while Michigan State had five. There were seven participants selected from nationwide recruitment.

Educational Training Experiences

The Mentor Component

Each post doctoral fellow was paired with a mentor for research collaboration. Background information regarding mentors and assistance in initial collaborative negotiations were provided by the co-directors. Final selection of mentors was carried out on a mutual basis between the fellow and the mentor according to compatibility of research interests and goals.

The mentor-fellow research collaboration experience was designed to promote a full understanding of what it means to conduct educational research and was viewed as the heart of the post doctoral program. It capitalized on learning through modeling, active learning, and socialization to the role of educational researcher. Through collaboration with a mentor, each research fellow practiced many of the specific skills studied previously in formal course work.

Equally important, each fellow gained a research colleague with whom hopefully would emerge a continuing research relationship.

In working with the mentors, post doctoral fellows engaged in a variety of activities which provided background and experience for further research pursuit. These activities included individual study, formal course work, critiquing current research, assisting in writing proposals, developing coding systems for observation data, and conducting fieldwork research.

The mentors and research areas selected by the post doctoral fellows were as follows:

First Cohort

Post Doctoral Fellow	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Jacqueline Caul	Dr. William Schmidt	Application of statistical models in research studies
Dr. Gordon Fooks	Dr. Phil Cusick	Field study research methods and research on vocational education related to blacks
Dr. Hakim Rashid	Dr. Jere Brophy	Research on teaching and research on early childhood education
Dr. Jacqueline Reed	Dr. Fred Erickson	Qualitative methods of research related to black student attrition in higher education
Dr. Martha Warfield	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research on school climate factors in desegregated schools

Second Cohort

Post Doctoral Fellow	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Aban Daruwalla	Dr. Don Freeman Dr. Bob Floden	Policy capturing research on teachers' content decisions in classrooms
Dr. Stella Hargett	Dr. Larry Lezotte Dr. Joe Darden	Research related to teacher efficacy and research on the development of professional self concept of black student teachers
Dr. Lonnie McIntyre	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research related to school climate in desegregated schools
Dr. Joseph Price	Dr. Jere Brophy	Research related to discipline and research related to disproportionate numbers of minority children in special education programs
Dr. Esther Ridley	Dr. Perry Lanier	Research related to the study of black students in the elementary science classroom

Third Cohort

Post Doctoral Fellow	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Gretchen Barbatsis	Dr. Linda Anderson Dr. Lee Shulman	Research on teaching and research on telecommunication
Dr. Jane Enty	Dr. Fred Erickson	Research on intercultural behavior related to dress
Dr. John Newby	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research on educational implications of desegregation

Third Cohort (1981-82) continued.

Post Doctoral Fellow	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Gene Pernell	Dr. Larry Lezotte Dr. Ron Edmonds	Effective schools research and research on teachers' practices related to special education
Dr. Flavio Vega	No specific mentor	Policy research on educational equity

The areas of research collaboration represent a broad range of topics and research methodologies. The wide array of research resources in the Institute for Research on Teaching and in the university provided considerable latitude in the fellow-mentor selection process.

The program provided modest travel support during the second year for fellows to return to Michigan State to work with mentors. The intention is, however, that the relationship will continue far beyond the training program, and that research mentors will become part of a network supportive of minorities' and women's research. Several fellows from the three cohorts have sent manuscripts to mentors for review and feedback and have also presented papers with their mentors at the annual meeting of AERA. It is believed that this type of interaction provides needed support for continued research productivity.

In regard to mentor-fellow research collaboration, program evaluation efforts identifed strengths and weaknesses as viewed by program participants. One fellow suggested several modifications that could be made in connection with selection of mentors.

> The value of the mentor-post doctoral relationship might be improved by a more structured approach both in the selection of a mentor and in the monitoring of the relationship. Problems in selecting mentors seemed to occur because information on current research projects was not provided. Instead, post doctorates were given an indication of general research interests, some of which

was ambiguous and some of which was not reflected in current research projects. In addition, prospective mentors did not seem to understand the nature of the post doctorate-mentor relationship. These two factors made it difficult for the participants unfamiliar with the mentor resources or with the program to negotiate a meaningful mentor-post doctorate relationship.

I would recommend that the directors of the program do the following to expedite the formation of the mentor-post doctorate relationship: (a) clearly explain the objectives of the relationship to prospective faculty mentors; (b) ascertain which among the faculty are willing to work with a post doctorate fellow; (c) provide a description of current research projects or interests of those faculty willing to work with a post doctorate fellow; (d) provide a list of research interests of the post doctorates to the prospective mentors. Prospective mentors should be able to initiate the relationship as easily as the participant might. It ought to be a negotiated relationship based on information from both sources. Mentors did not seem committed as they might have been, and as is necessary for this most important component of the program.

Still, most fellows believed they profited from the mentor collaboration, though one expressed reservations about the institutional recognition given.

Webster's definition of supervise has the connotation (all the way from its Latin etymology) of overseeing, directing, i.e., having primary responsibility for an underling, one less-than, one not-yet initiated. I am not arguing that this supervisory model was inappropriate at the beginning of the relationship with my mentor. What is important is that the relationship moved steadily toward what I will refer to as a "consulting" model. This model carries with it the connotation of deliberation and thoughtfulness between two people who came together to seek a perspective. While I believe that my mentor and I have been highly successful in effecting this necessary transition, I believe that the institution has failed to recognize its significance.

For other fellows, collaboration with a mentor was an unqualified beneficial experience. For example, one fellow wrote:

The "mentor" concept and its implementation worked extremely well for me, and I view it as being critical to the program for it enabled each trainee to work in a compatible area with an outstanding researcher. In my experience, Jere Brophy was not only compatible in his professional interest and activities, but was very generous in allowing me to participate in his research projects as a vehicle to increase my learning. Furthermore, it was Jere who provided me with immense guidance in conceptualizing the

> research proposal which I developed (and received funding) while still in the post-doc program. I feel that this kind of "mentor" support exemplifies the potential benefits of the "mentor" relationship.

Another fellow stated:

> One of the program highlights for me was the opportunity to work with an experienced educational researcher. My mentor-fellow relationship with Dr. Erickson gave me the guidance I needed to fulfill my program objectives. As a result of my collaboration with him, I learned ethnographic research methods, increased my knowledge of anthropology which broadens and strengthens my background in the social sciences, conducted a research project, and developed a plan for future educational research.

Mentor-fellow research collaboration worked well for some post-doctoral fellows, but not for all. It appears that while information regarding the mentors and assistance in selection was provided by the co-directors, additional assistance was needed for some participants. Also, it is important that the mentor role should be clearly defined and communicated to those who serve in that role. More careful monitoring of the relationship in terms of role-perception and collaborative opportunities would also serve to strengthen the arrangement.

Post Doctoral Research Seminar

Post doctoral fellows participated in a special research seminar designed by the project co-directors to:

1. create a sense of community among participants;
2. facilitate the sharing of past experiences, aspirations for the future, and how to cope with the constraints placed on minorities and women by higher education and the research establishment;
3. create a perspective on how specific research interests fit within the broad area of educational research; and
4. provide mini courses in a variety of research-related activities, including technical writing, understanding the process of submitting articles for publication and the review process, obtaining funding for research, understanding protection of human subjects and confidentiality rules and regulations.

To accomplish these purposes, twice weekly seminars were held during the first quarter of participation for each of the three cohorts. The first session involved an orientation to the program and the following session focused on familiarization with library facilities. The remainder of the seminars were led by the research mentors who described their projects and areas of research. Feedback from post doctoral fellows indicated that these sessions provided useful information regarding IRT projects and added to their understanding of the breadth of educational research.

During winter and spring terms, the seminars provided opportunities for fellows to present their own research and receive feedback, study several different methodologies used in educational research, and learn more about a variety of topics including the peer review process, sources of research support, and the like. The frequency and focus of seminars for winter and spring terms varied by cohort. For the first cohort, twice weekly seminars continued throughout the year. The second cohort met twice weekly through winter term, with once-weekly seminars held spring term. Based on feedback from the post doctoral fellows the format was modified for the third cohort to allow greater time for individual research and writing as the year progressed. Seminars for winter and spring terms were scheduled as requested by the post doctoral fellows with seminars held approximately once a week.

While all of the seminars were considered useful, several were viewed by the post doctoral fellows as being particularly beneficial. Over the three year period it became evident that the post doctoral fellows particularly valued sessions devoted to the review and critique of their professional writing. Other highly valued seminars were those

focusing on technical writing skills and those concerned with the process of publishing in professional journals. Also rated highly were seminars involving discussion of the AERA tape series, "Alternative Methodologies in Educational Research."

The following statement from a post doctoral fellow is typical of feedback received on the seminars:

> The seminar component served a number of valuable purposes. Those devoted to educational research provided an opportunity to refine general research knowledge as well as identify scholars who could serve as resources in future research activity. Those devoted to computer use refreshed knowledge of statistical procedures and provided opportunities to learn and practice new approaches to data analysis. Finally, seminars devoted to the presentation of post-doctoral research papers provided the opportunity for practice in presenting research and the experiences of seeking and using input from colleagues.

Technical Writing

Technical writing was given high priority from the very beginning of the program. As has been stated, an early seminar introduced post doctoral fellows to the university library facilities. Other seminars were devoted to technical writing skills with assistance provided by the senior editor of the Institute for Research on Teaching. As a part of these seminars, all fellows were provided copies of the APA Publication Manual, VanLeunen's A Handbook for Scholars, and Strunk and White's The Elements of Style.

Each post doctoral fellow was expected to complete by the end of the year of residence at least one manuscript for submission to a refereed journal and one research proposal for possible funding. All fellows did complete at least one manuscript and made a presentation on the manuscript to the other fellows and co-directors. Several fellows completed two or more manuscripts and made multiple presentations to the

group. Unfortunately, several fellows did not reach the goal of having submitted a manuscript for publication by the end of the first year. Over half of the fellows also completed a research proposal and most had a proposal in progress by the close of the first year. A few proposals were even submitted for funding prior to the end of the first year (though some were done collaboratively with a research mentor). One of these was funded by the United States Department of Education.

Since completing their year of residence, most of the post doctoral fellows have continued to write, and several have made presentations at national research conferences. Some of these activities represent continued collaboration with a research mentor, but there has already been a considerable amount of independent work as well. Unfortunately, no systematic records have been maintained on the publishing and presentation activities of the fellows following completion of their year of residence. Thus, these statements are based on casual knowledge from conversations, scanning of conference programs, and happening to notice articles in print.

Computer Applications Seminars

Joe Byers, a professor of educational psychology, offered a series of seminars on computer applications in educational research for each of the three cohorts of the program. The seminars were tailored to the needs and interests of the post doctoral fellows.

To provide flexibility in topics and activities, the first two meetings were devoted to a general presentation of possible areas of study. While the focus of subsequent sessions varied somewhat across cohorts, there was a great deal that was common. Fellows learned to use an interactive terminal for accessing the CEC mainframe computer at

Michigan State. Experience was provided in using fully interactive software analysis packages such as MINITAB as well as the more common batch processing analysis systems such as SPSS. Fellows also gained experience with text processing programs for use in manuscript development.

Sessions were scheduled weekly for approximately three hours each. Instruction was generally didactic, though on many occasions lively discussions among the fellows added to the richness and realism of the topic being presented. These discussions were more apt to occur later in the year when the fellows were beginning to address their own data sets and face questions of analysis directly related to their own research work. In addition to the common meetings, fellows were encouraged to meet in twos and threes to practice skills under development in the group sessions. These so-called "out-of-class" work periods usually occured early in the year when fellows were learning how to use an interactive computer terminal and were acquiring the rudiments of data entry and editing. Fellows were provided with a computer access account and enough resources, CPU time, disk storage, etc. to take care of their pedagogical and research needs.

The responses to the computer sessions were enthusiastic. The following statement from a post doctoral fellow is representative of feedback from others.

> One aspect of participation in the program from which I benefitted considerably was my interaction with Dr. Joe Byers. The opportunity to design a project with another post-doctoral fellow, collect the data, and then analyze the data with Dr. Byers' assistance was definitely one of the highlights of the program. After working with him I really felt that my quantitative skills had been enhanced considerably.

Coursework

Although formal coursework was not a requirement in the post doctoral program, tuition and course materials were available for one course per term for each post doctoral fellow. Fellows were free to select courses which would compliment their knowledge of educational research. In general, the fellows elected to take relatively few formal courses.

In the first cohort, only Dr. Jacqueline Caul took a course, educational statistics. In the second cohort, Dr. Esther Ridley took a three-course sequence in ethnographic research methods, and Dr. Aban Daruwalla took a course in field research. In the third cohort, Dr. Jane Entry took the three-course sequence in ethnographic research methods, a course in anthropology, and a course in African studies.

In explaining their relatively low use of the opportunity to take formal coursework, post doctoral fellows referred to the heavy demands on their time made by active participation in conducting research and writing reports. The following post-doctoral evaluation statement reflects the overall need for time:

> The opportunity to attend classes was useful to those participating in the program who wanted to develop new approaches to research. While I would recommend retaining this component of the program, it seems to me that the time commitment it requires should be carefully weighed by participants. It should be an adjunct to, not a major component of, the year in residence.

The courses that provided the strongest direction in terms of carrying out research projects were the ethnographic research courses. Two Morgan State post doctoral fellows who took the three-course sequence conducted field research as a part of those courses. Their plans for continued research at Morgan State reflect the background

gained in these courses. Overall, it appears that the coursework component of the program is valuable, but that it should be optional to participants.

Visiting Scholars

The visiting scholars component of the program was designed to extend the number of role models available to post doctoral fellows. Across the three cohorts, 17 nationally-recognized minority and women educational researchers discussed their research and professional careers with the fellows (see Table 1 for summary of visiting scholars and their areas of research). Of the 17 scholars, 14 were black and two were Hispanic. Three of the scholars were women. Equally important, however, were the research topics visiting scholars discussed. As seen in Table 1, not only were the visiting scholars minorities and women, but their research reflected a concern for the status of minorities and women in education.

The first visiting scholar of the year for each cohort was identified by the co-directors. All other visiting scholars were identified by the post doctoral fellows in consultation with the co-directors. Three of the visiting scholars were from Morgan State University, and their direct participation in the program also served to strengthen the ties between the two universities.

A format initiated early in the program was used for all visiting scholars. Well in advance of the visit to campus, readings were identified by the visiting scholar and were to be read by the post doctoral fellows in preparation for the visit. Typically two or three

Table 1

Visiting Scholars

Visiting Scholar	Research Topics
1979-80	
Fall Quarter	
Dr. Jean Carew (deceased) Stanford University Boystown Center for Youth Development	Cognitive and Social Development of Young Children
Dr. Edmund Gordon Yale University	Research on Compensatory Education, Program Evaluation and Inequality in the U.S.
Winter Quarter	
Dr. William Hall Dept. of Psychology University of Maryland College Park (then at the University of Illinois)	Language Acquisition of Young Black Children
Dr. Phillip Carey Director-Institute for Urban Research Morgan State University	Research on Minority Student Retention in Higher Education
Spring Quarter	
Dr. Asa Hilliard Callaway Professor of the Department of Educational/Foundations Georgia State University	Aptitude and Achievement
Dr. Edgar Epps University of Chicago	Research on Effects of School Desegregation
1980-81	
Fall Quarter	
Professor Ron Edmonds Senior Researcher Institute for Research on Teaching Michigan State University (then at Harvard University)	Research on School and Desegregation

1980-81, Fall Quarter (continued)

Dr. Barbara Jackson Dean, School of Education Morgan State University	Research on Status of Black Women in Educational Administration and Urban School Desegregation

Winter Quarter

Dr. Robert Hill Senior Researcher Bureau of Social Science Research Washington D.C. (then Director of Research, National Urban League Washington, D.C.)	Educational Research for Blacks
Dr. Kenneth Tollett Director, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy Howard University	Establishment of a Research Environment on a Black Campus
Dr. Asa Hilliard Calloway Professor of the Department of Educational Foundations Georgia State University	Research on Black Education

Spring Quarter

Dr. Luis Laosa Senior Researcher Educational Testing Service	Factors Which Have Negative Effects upon School Achievement of Students from Minority Backgrounds

1981-82

Fall Quarter

Dr. Howard Taylor Department of Sociology Yale University	Research on Small Group Processes and the I.Q. Heritability Controversy
Dr. Curtis Banks Senior Researcher Educational Testing Service	Research on Black Children's Personality and Recent Research Implications

Winter Quarter

Dr. Jacquelynne Parsons Department of Psychology University of Michigan	Research on Sex Differences in the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics During Elementary and Junior High School

Spring Quarter

Dr. Eugene Garcia Director, Bilingual/Bicultural Center Arizona State University	Research on Bilingualism in Young Children
Dr. Andrew Billingsley President, Morgan State University	Research on the Black Family

manuscripts were identified as most closely related to the work that would be discussed during the visit, and these were read most closely.

Each visiting scholar came to campus for a two-day period. During that period the scholar presented three seminars. Two seminars were limited to the post doctoral fellows and project co-directors. The third seminar involved a more formal presentation to a university-wide audience. On one evening of the visit, a party was held at the house of one of the co-directors to facilitate interaction on a social level. Each visiting scholar received a modest $300 honorarium plus expenses for participation in the program.

The statements that follow typify the positive response of fellows to the visiting scholars component.

> The talent, the accomplishments, and the research expertise of the visiting scholars from various institutions across the USA was par excellence. The opportunity to relate to these highly successful educational researchers--who were themselves minorities and women--was simultaneously inspiring and educational.

> If asked to single out the most meaningful aspect of the program, I would mention the visiting scholars; this is because an immediate bond is established when you have a minority role-model who brings an insight to the forum that adds an additional aspect of realism. Their experiences, the problems they solved, the pitfalls to avoid, and the willingness to allow us to become members of a minority network provides a form of support that you feel you can always rely upon.

> The visiting scholar component of the program provided the perspective of a wider range of resources and a number of scholar models. Most importantly, however, it exemplified the effectiveness of national networking of scholars of similar research interests.

Overall, the visiting scholars program proved to be beneficial, both to the post doctoral program as well as to the university. Minority and women researchers were made visible to the university community and

accessible to the faculty and students. Through the participation of visiting scholars in the program, a research network was initiated for the post doctoral fellows that is now in use.

Part of the success of the visiting scholars component was the response of individuals invited to participate. In the three years of the program involving 17 visiting scholars, not a single invitation was turned down. Many of the visiting scholars commented on the benefit they gained from the experience, indicating it afforded opportunity for an intimate forum regarding their research topics.

Conference Attendance and Research Site Visitations

Attending national conferences of research associations and visitations to other research sites were encouraged, and funds were made available by the program. The opportunity to participate in research conferences, observe paper and panel presentations and to interact with others engaged in educational research was for most a new experience. The 1980 AERA annual meeting in Boston was attended by all five fellows in the cohort. Three fellows of the second cohort attended the 1981 AERA meeting held in Los Angeles, and four fellows of the third cohort attended the 1982 AERA meeting in New York City.

In addition to the AERA annual meeting, several of the post doctoral fellows elected to attend other professional meetings related to their research areas. These meetings included the Council for the Exceptional Child meeting in New York City, Human Relations in Education meeting at the University of Minnesota, and the Association for Education in Journalism annual convention at Ohio University.

Generally, support was limited to one professional meeting for each post-doctoral fellow.

The provision for major conference attendance was viewed as a valuable aspect of the program by all participants. The following two statements reflect the typical response.

> The opportunities to attend national research conventions provided further experience in recognizing and employing the concept of national contact with scholars of similar interests.

and

> Another, more formal aspect of the program was the trip to the AERA conference in Boston, 1980. Two things happened on that trip that made me reassess my perception of professional meetings and realize the importance of that kind of experience. First of all, after experiencing my first AERA conference, I was no longer in awe of those who were fortunate to present papers. I came away with the feeling that I could produce work just as good as (and in many cases better than) what I had seen presented.
>
> The second relevation was the recognition that this was a setting in which a great deal of professional networking took place. The opportunity to strengthen past ties and develop new ones was clearly as beneficial to one's career as the presentation of a professional paper.

Collegial Relationships

Informal interactions that took place on a day-to-day basis played an important part in establishing lasting professional relationships among post doctoral fellows. Collaborative activities such as review and critique of manuscripts and proposals was a direct outgrowth of the collegial relationship that existed among the fellows.

Throughout the program a variety of arrangements and activities were planned to foster these relationships. Office space was provided for fellows in close proximity to each other as well as IRT researchers and staff. In this way, materials could be shared and discussions held in connection with fellows' research.

Social gatherings throughout the year provided occasions for informal interaction with visiting scholars, IRT and College of Education faculty, and faculty across the university. A special reception was held by the co-directors early in the year to welcome each cohort of post doctoral fellows to Michigan State. College and university administrators, research mentors, IRT and college faculty were invited to meet the post doctoral fellows. An informal social gathering was held for each visiting scholar, thus providing opportunity for interaction between the post doctoral fellows and that researcher. A post doctoral picnic was held at the end of each program year. The picnics were attended by the families of the co-directors, post doctoral fellows, mentors, and others associated with the program. This occasion also served as a setting for presentation of certificates of participation to each post doctoral fellow.

The year of research at Michigan State provided opportunity for establishing relationships which we hope will continue far beyond the years of program participation. These relationships provide the basis for networking among post doctoral fellows, MSU senior researchers, and visiting scholars.

Program Evaluation

Quarterly Evaluations

Evaluation of program activities was conducted by the co-directors at the end of each quarter in order to gain insights into the participants' experiences. Post doctoral fellows were asked to described and evaluate 1) their choice of mentor and the selection process, 2) strengths and weaknesses of the mentor-fellow relationship,

3) any experiences they had in data collection, analysis and interpretation, 4) the educational research seminars, 5) the visiting scholars that term, 6) any coursework experience, and 7) collegial research relationships. In addition, fellows were asked to respond to three general questions: 1) Has the post doctoral experience strengthened or weakened your desire to do educational research? Why?; 2) Do you feel your background was adequate to fit the program as it is being conducted? Why?; and 3) What are your views on educational research?

Post-doctoral fellow responses to these questions served as bases for program modification and planning for the following term. A final evaluation was conducted by the co-directors at the end of each year to assess the overall experience for each cohort. The questions were the same as those in the quarterly evaluations. A final evaluation statement was requested from each participant by the co-directors at the end of the three year program.

Through the written evaluation, the post doctoral fellows had opportunity to reflect on the various segments of the program. Data gathered from the quarterly evaluations provided evidence of the participants' satisfaction with the structure of the program, progress made related to research collaboration, and suggestions for basis for any needed modifications in the program.

Several aspects of the quarterly evaluation are important. Through these evaluations, difficulties post doctoral fellows were having in establishing a collaborative relationship with their mentors were identified. In several cases, these difficulties were resolved with assistance from the co-directors. The quarterly evaluations were

particularly useful as a way of involving the participants in planning for the following term. The three general questions of the quarterly evaluations provided opportunity for post doctoral fellows to reflect on their overall perceptions of their participation in an educational research community. The responses provided the co-directors with evidence of growth and/or change in perspectives regarding educational research as well as indications of promise for research productivity beyond program participation.

Annual Evaluations

The annual evaluation provided a more global assessment of each cohort's research training experiences. Post doctoral fellows reported on progress made in research and writing activities, as well as reactions to the various program components in terms of perceived benefits over the year of residency. At this point they could also project future plans consistent with the program goals and needed support for the second year of research collaboration. Analysis of the evaluation data was made to determine what modifications should be made for the following year.

Over the three year period modifications stemming from evaluations included greater flexibility of program time for post doctoral manuscript preparation and review, and the incorporation of computer applications as a formal component of the program. Collaborative arrangements with Morgan State were also modified in an effort to increase their involvement in the program.

Evaluation at the End of Three Years

At the end of the three years of the program, the co-directors made a request to the post doctoral fellows for a written evaluation statement regarding the research training program. The purpose of the request was to get an overall reaction to the model for educational research training. Responses to the request were submitted by 12 the 15 fellows (see Appendix B for unedited post doctoral statements). Excerpts from the statements are included throughout the report in the description of the various program components.

The request made to the post doctoral fellows was stated as follows:

> Based on your experience, what would you recommend be included in the design of future programs? Similarly, what approaches would you recommend against? In addition to suggestions for program design, the narrative should also describe what the MSU program meant to you.

Generally, the evaluation statements reflected thoughtful consideration of the research training experience. Every participant who responded indicated that the program had been a positive experience and that their skills in educational research had been significantly improved.

Most fellows viewed the mentor-fellow research collaboration component as particularly important to the program, though several had suggestions for improvement. Careful preparation, implementation, and monitoring of this component is essential in research training productivity. In addition, responses indicated that a more structured arrangement for a second year of research collaboration with mentors is needed to provide sustained support to fellows as they resume their individual careers.

The other program training components, the visiting scholars program, research seminars, computer seminars, attendance at national conventions, and the year of residency in a research community were viewed as strengths of the program. All responses indicated these components of the program were beneficial in the form in which they were delivered.

Collaboration with Morgan State University

As has been described, the proposal for the post doctoral program provided for a collaborative arrangement between Morgan State University and Michigan State University. Originally, there were to be five participants from each university faculty and five participants selected nationally in each cohort. Because of reduced funding from the National Institute of Education, funds were only available to support four participants in each cohort. Reflecting the commitment to Morgan State as a developing graduate institution with a new Urban Research Institute, two of the four participants in each cohort were to be from Morgan State with one each from the other two populations. Further, there was the provision for Morgan State faculty to serve as mentors for post doctoral fellows.

At the very outset of the program, however, Morgan State participation became problemmatic. Inadequate communication of the program's availability to Morgan State faculty and a lack of understanding of the program among Morgan State administrators resulted in no Morgan State applicants for the first cohort. These problems were partially solved by the co-directors meeting with the deans of colleges at Morgan State to describe the program and to indicate that financial

support was available to partially offset the costs of faculty participation. The special one-week orientation session at Michigan State for interested Morgan State faculty was also helpful. Further, the invitation of Morgan State faculty to serve as visiting scholars to the program had a positive effect. As a results, two Morgan State faculty participated in the second cohort.

To further strengthen the collaborative relationship between Michigan State and Morgan State, the second cohort of post doctoral fellows spent one week on the Morgan State campus. The visit provided fellows with an opportunity to see the research underway at the Urban Research Institute there and to better understand the role that educational research plays at that university. During the week, two visiting scholars participated in the program, providing some benefits of the program to the larger Morgan State faculty. Nevertheless, the third cohort had only one participant from Morgan State.

While collaboration between Morgan State University and Michigan State University was problemmatic in that only half as many Morgan State faculty participated as fellows in the program as had been intended, the collaboration was still viewed as beneficial. The three Morgan State post doctoral fellows were excellent participants and each reported very favorably on their experiences in the program.

As a final measure in the program toward strengthening the collaboration, Dr. Andrew Billingsley, President of Morgan State University, served as the keynote speaker at a mini-conference held at the end of the third year for all 15 post doctoral fellows. This mini-conference provided opportunities for the three Morgan State participants to discuss plans for continued research activities with

each other and with the president of their university. Further, Dr. Billingsley's presence was a highly visible demonstration of Morgan State's commitment to the goals of the program. During the mini-conference, Dr. Billingsley repeatedly expressed his support of the educational research activities of his faculty and discussions were initiated as to how these activities could be supported at Morgan State in the coming years.

Additional Program Activities

Inter-America Research Associates Case Study

In addition to the on-going program activities, two other important events occured during the last year of the program. The first was the Inter-America Research Associates case study of the Michigan State University minorities and women's research program. Our program was one of 10 selected from the 48 programs nationwide for in-depth study. Two researchers, Kathleen Wells and Saundra Furey, visited the campus May 10-12, 1982, to conduct extensive interviews with the co-directors, selected program participants, and college and university officials. Scheduling and other logistical arrangements were carried out by the co-directors. Additional interviews with past program participants and Morgan State University officials were conducted by the researchers either in person or by telephone. We look forward to reviewinng the results of the case study of our program as well as the descriptions of the other programs selected.

Post Doctoral Mini-Conference

The Post Doctoral Mini-Conference, held May 19-21, 1982, was a highlight of the three-year program. (See Appendix C for detailed

description.) All 15 post doctoral fellows convened to present papers, meet with mentors, and to engage in dialogue relative to the pursuit of a career in educational research. As previously stated, Dr. Andrew Billingsley, President of Morgan State University, served as the conference keynote speaker.

The purposes of the conference were to reinforce the commitment to educational research of fellows from the first two cohorts, provide all fellows the opportunity to present their research in a research conference setting, and to build professional associations among fellows across the three cohorts. Each of the 15 post doctoral fellows made a formal presentation of their research and gave a brief up-date of their professional plans. Discussion following each fellow's presentation was lively and demonstrated both interest in the presentation and the knowledgeableness of the group about educational research.

Overall, the conference placed additional emphasis on the need for educational research networks for minorities and women. The fact that all 15 fellows participated in the conference reflects positively on their assessment of the worth of their post doctoral experiences and the merit of holding a culminating conference.

Where Post Doctoral Fellows Are Now

The 15 program participants have now returned to former positions or are in transition to new positions (see Appendix D for current addresses).

1979-80 Cohort

Dr. Jacqueline Caul has resumed her position as assistant professor in the Department of Teacher Education at Michigan State University.

Part of her responsibility includes research on teacher education. Dr. Gordon Fooks accepted a position with a private consulting firm in Cleveland, Ohio, and serves as an urban counselor on that staff. Dr. Hakim Rashid recently received appointment in the Department of Early Childhood Education at the University of South Carolina. Immediately after his participation in the program he took a position as researcher with the High-Scope Research Center in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Dr. Jacqueline Reed has recently been appointed to a new position as employee management specialist with the Washington, D.C. public school system. She is presently conducting a needs assessment on employee assistance issues. Dr. Martha Warfield is director of her own consulting firm, Kalamazoo Community Counseling, Inc., Kalamazoo, Michigan. The firm has been awarded several grants over the past two years.

1980-81 Cohort

Upon completion of the training program, Dr. Aban Daruwalla accepted a position as civilian educational specialist at Fort Lee, Virginia. Her work involves research related to educational programs provided for military personnel. The Morgan State University participants returned to their former departments. Dr. Stella Hargett resumed her position as assistant professor in the Department of Social Psychology. She continues to pursue her research on black student attrition in higher education. Dr. Esther Ridley returned to her position as professor of science education. She has initiated negotiations with the Baltimore public school regarding research on classroom science teaching. Dr. Lonnie McIntyre returned to his

position as associate professor in the Department of Administration and Curriculum at Michigan State University. He and a faculty colleague have recently co-authored a manuscript on instructional assistance in primary grade reading which has been submitted for publication. Dr. Joe Price received federal funding for a research proposal he wrote while a post doctoral fellow. For the one-year period of the grant, he joined the Michigan State faculty. He is currently a counseling specialist with a private consulting firm in Detroit, Michigan.

1981-82 Cohort

Dr. Gretchen Barbatsis has resumed her position as assistant professor in the Department of Telecommunications at Michigan State University. She has recently submitted two manuscripts for publication in professional communications journals. Dr. Eugene Pernell returned to his position in the Michigan State Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and Special Education as an associate professor. He continues to use educational research in his work with undergraduate and graduate special education students. Dr. John Newby returned to Bowling Green University to assume a faculty position as associate professor in the Department of Educational Administration. Prior to his participation in the program he held an administrative position; however, upon his return, he chose a faculty position which would allow time for research and writing activities. Dr. Flavio Vega is seeking a position in the area of human relations education. At the present time he is completing a book on human relations education which he researched while participating in the program.

Summary

Based on evaluations provided by the post doctoral fellows and our own assessments the program, New Paths Toward Research Leadership, was a success. The primary goal of the program was to identify minorities and women who had completed a doctorate but who were not currently active in educational research and, within a two-year period, provide the knowledge, skills, and motivation to become productive members of the educational research community.

At this point, several participants seem to be making good progress toward the program goal as evidenced by their professional positions, their writing, and their presentations at national conferences. A few participants are not currently active in educational research and may never be, though they have good positions related to education. A third group of participants continue to want to do educational research, though their productivity thus far has been low. We are still hopeful that they will progress, but in large part this will depend upon their receiving increased support for research (primarily in the form of released time).

Mentor-fellow research collaboration was viewed by both program co-directors and fellows as the single most important component of the program, but it was not without problems. When the mentor was actively engaged in one or more large educational research projects of direct interest to the fellow, the collaboration was excellent and fulfilled both parties' expectations. However, if the mentor was between projects or if the fellow was particularly interested in his/her own research, collaboration did not evolve and neither party was satisfied. Unfortunately, both problems were difficult to eliminate completely.

Some fellows were particularly anxious to work with a specific individual even if he or she did not have an on-going research project at the time. Other fellows were strongly committed to pursuing their own research agenda, though from an educational perspective they would have been better served to wait and first learn through work with a mentor. In retrospect, there were a few occasions where perhaps the co-directors should have been more forceful in helping fellows select and begin working with a mentor. The problem was not a lack of awareness that difficulties existed, but rather in getting a new mentor relationship started. Still, for all but a few post doctoral fellows, research collaboration was the most important experience in the program.

The weakest part of the program was the second year of continued research collaboration. In some cases this worked well, but only because the fellow and mentor were each committed to continuing. More structured experiences and a budget are needed to make the second year of the program effective. At least one visit of the fellow to return to Michigan State and one visit of the mentor to the fellow's place of employment should have been required and supported in the budget.

The program's major strengths appear to have been recruitment of promising candidates, research seminars, computer seminars, the visiting scholars component, support for attending national research conferences, and the conference held for participants in all three cohorts at the end of the three years of funding.

Each year of recruitment there were many more candidates of high promise than there were fellowships available. The greatest success in recruitment was from the national pool of recent doctoral recipients. While fewer in number, there were also more excellent candidates than

fellowships available from the Michigan State University faculty. In fact, two Michigan State faculty participated through university support without benefit of any compensation from the federal contracts. The three participants from Morgan State were excellent, but unfortunately, recruitment there was less successful in that we had intended to support twice that number. Part of the recruitment problem at Morgan State University might have been solved had a representative from that institution in a position of authority been integrally involved in the original design of the post doctoral program. Still, Morgan State faculty are used to heavy teaching loads with few assigned time for research. This may also explain the lack of interest in faculty participation.

The research seminar was specifically designed for and limited to the post doctoral participants. Many of the topics covered in the seminar are important to becoming a productive educational researcher but are not generally taught in doctoral programs (e.g., knowledge of the peer review process in refereed journals). The seminar was also essential to establishing collegial relationships among the participants. Based on the success of the research seminar, a similar seminar has been created for a pre-doctoral program sponsored by the Institute for Research on Teaching. The commitment to affirmative action has carried over into that program as well. The first cohort of six interns includes two black males and three white females.

Through the visiting scholars component, 15 outstanding minority and women researchers were brought to the Michigan State campus. Their presence not only had a profound effect upon the post doctoral fellows but increased the visibility of minority researchers and research on

minority issues for the entire university community. One of the visiting scholars is now a full professor in education at Michigan State. Several other of the visiting scholars are being considered for participation in a year-long minority visiting scholar program that is being initiated.

The computer seminars were also designed specifically for the post doctoral fellows and limited to their participation. The seminars were "hands on" activity oriented and gave all participants much needed skills in a variety of computer applications.

All of the participants attended one major national research conference. For most, this was a first time experience. As a result of attendance, nearly all fellows set as a personal goal getting on the program of a national research conference within the next two or three years. Many have already accomplished that goal.

The highlight of the program, however, was the conference for post doctoral fellows at the end of the three years of funding. All 15 fellows attended and each presented their research. From comments made, the experience appeared to increase most fellows' commitment to educational research. In particular, the accomplishments of the first cohort fellows, who had completed the year of residency two years prior to the conference, was an inspiration to those just completing their residence.

Appendix A

RECRUITMENT MATERIALS

Institute for Research on Teaching
and
College of Education
Michigan State University
in collaboration with
Institute for Urban Research
and
Graduate Studies
Morgan State University

Announce a

Post-Doctoral Program in Educational Research for Minorities and Women

Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Request for Additional Information

Please send me a detailed description of the Post-Doctoral Training Program for Minorities and Women.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone: Area Code _____ Number _____

Advanced Studies Program in Educational Research for Minorities and Women

The Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT) and the College of Education, in cooperation with Morgan State University, have developed a post-doctoral program for minorities and women who aspire to careers in educational research. The program, sponsored in part by the National Institute of Education, consists of two parts: (1) one academic year (September 1981 - May 1982) in residence at Michigan State University, and (2) an additional year of research collaboration. Fellowships are available for outstanding candidates from any of a variety of disciplines or fields—candidates who have not recently specialized in educational research. The number of awards that will be available is contingent on funding.

Educational Research at Michigan State University

Michigan State University is a major national center for research in education. Research is conducted by various departments in the College of Education and, in particular, the Institute for Research on Teaching. The IRT, founded in 1976 by the National Institute of Education, focuses on teacher decision making. Its projects include studies of reading diagnosis and remediation; classroom management strategies; instruction in the areas of language arts, reading and mathematics; teacher planning; effects of external pressures on teachers' content decisions; and teachers' perceptions of student affect. The IRT staff draws on researchers from different disciplines.

Activities of Program Participants

The post-doctoral program during the first year of study includes (1) collaboration with an experienced educational researcher, (2) a research seminar, (3) a visiting scholars program, (4) collaboration with Morgan State University's Institute for Urban Research, and (5) the opportunity for formal course work. Emphasis in this part of the program is on **active learning,** that is, fellows taking responsibility for significant parts of collaborative research. Activities will be tailored to individual fellows' knowledge of education and educational research. Technical writing skills will be given high priority. Fellows completing the program should have improved research skills, familiarity with the various stages typical of educational research projects, understanding of how their research interests fit within educational research as a whole, and a plan for conducting an educational study. The training program includes a second year of "mentor-fellow" research collaboration, thus insuring a continued relationship with an active educational researcher.

Selection Criteria

The process for recruiting and selecting research fellows will be based on the following criteria:

1. Candidates must hold the Ph.D. or equivalent degree by the start of the program.
2. Candidates must show promise for becoming active educational researchers.
3. Preference will be given to candidates who have not studied or worked in educational research within the last three years.
4. Preference will be given to minorities and women.

Application Procedures

Individuals interested in applying for the Post-Doctoral Studies Program should provide the following:

1. Curriculum vitae.
2. Personal statement, including (a) career goals (why educational research is an interesting career alternative), (b) area of research interest (outline of research you wish to pursue), and (c) types of training or research experience desired.
3. At least three letters from individuals qualified to comment on your potential for this program.

Additional Information

A detailed description of the Advanced Studies Program may be acquired by contacting:

Andrew C. Porter or Jacquelyn R. Nickerson, Project Coordinators
Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education,
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824 (517) 353-9761

Or, for Morgan State applicants:

Phillip Carey or Clara Adams, Project Coordinators
Institute for Urban Research, 204 Soldiers Armory,
Baltimore, Maryland 21234 (301) 444-3004

Application Deadline: April 30, 1981

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

Appendix B

EVALUATION STATEMENTS

BY

POST DOCTORAL FELLOWS

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 1

Without reservation, my post doctoral training in educational research with the Institute for Research on Teaching was both personally and professionally an invaluable experience. At the more personal level, and for the first time, I could afford to seriously reflect on my goals, my objectives, and my commitment to the field of education and, more specifically, to educational research. The typical academic year of study and/or employment at most institutions allows litle or no time for this facet of one's professional development. At the more professional level, my experience here was conceivably more invaluable. The following constitute some of the aspects or components of the post doctoral program which helped make it an exceptional learning experience:

> The talent, the accomplishments, and the research expertise of the visiting scholars from various institutions across the U.S. was par excellence. The opportunity to relate to these highly successful educational researchers--who were themselves minorities and women--was simultaneously inspiring and educational.
>
> The diverse areas of knowledge represented by the staff and faculty within both the Institute and the College of Education also provided a wide range of topics and issues for discussion and examination. Their individual commitment to the post doctoral program and their ready willingness to participate and to contribute as lecturers, consultants, mentors, colleagues, and friends made this fellowship a unique experience.
>
> In addition, the opportunity to work through an intensive growth experience in fellowship with other minorities and women, together with an integrated faculty, provided an especially intimate forum for the discussion of similar problems relating to the issues of race and sex in education.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the post doctoral program here at M.S.U. was the visible high level of professional commitment to education and educational research on the part of the staff and faculty. Having several years of study and work experience in several institutions of higher education, I would candidly say that I was most impressed with what

I deemed to be an exceptionally serious commitment to research in education.

In terms of my personal recommendations for or against future post doctoral programs for minorities and women in educational research, I would note only the following:

> The field of education, and therefore the area of educational research as well, is understandably broad and comprehensive. It takes several years of undergraduate and graduate study, coupled with more years of clinical internships and professional work experience to train effective practitioners in educational administration, educational psychology, in higher education, in sociology of education, etc. I sincerely believe that one academic year, as intensive and structured as it may well be, is simply too short a period of time to train one in educational research. While I learned a great deal this year, I just now feel prepared to proceed with what I had initially proposed to accomplish. I would very strongly recommend an additional period of support, preferrably a second academic year, for independent, on-campus research and scholarship. In addition, I would note that I benefitted most from the programs more focused approach to quantitative and qualitative research methods, data gathering and analysis, instrument development, experimental design, and the issues of research reliability and validity. I would recommend an even greater programmatic emphasis in these areas insofar as they form the foundation of all good research.

In conclusion, I sincerely believe that the post doctoral program at the Institute has helped to bridge the very visible gap in opportunities for minorities and women in educational research. At a time when the tragic consequences of race and sex bias, prejudice, and discrimination in our schools and society are becoming increasingly apparent, it behooves us to continue to train minorities and women to directly address the issues, needs, and concerns. Not to do so will only compound that tragedy.

Given this, and given my experience with the Institute's program, I would whole-heartedly support the continuation of the Post Doctoral Program in Educational Research for Minorities and Women now and in the future.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 2

The educational research training that I received during my post doctoral year was very timely in that it allowed me to acquire valuable research and computer skills. It has rapidly become a requirement for successful college professors to be proficient researchers if they are to remain credible in their respective fields. Moreover minority researchers, especially, are non-existent or in very short supply in most fields. I feel that a minority research perspective would have had a tremendous positive influence on many of the federally funded programs that are currently being cutback or terminated. And the reality of reduced funding will lead, no doubt, to intense competition on the part of researchers for the meager funds that are available. This means that new researchers, i.e., minorities and women, will be competing with established researchers who will probably continue to win the grants because of proven track records. I suppose this is not an impossible task but it is more difficult when funds are limited.

Another potential area that must be considered is the extremely competitive publishing market. The network of established researchers continues to operate here as well; getting materials on conference programs or into well-known journals still presents obstacles that need to be overcome because the recognized experts in the field often act as gatekeepers for acceptance. The alternative is to publish in less well-known journals, and this means you run the risk of not having the status that comes with pubishing in more well-known journals. The two conditions described above in no way diminish the value of the program and I wholeheartedly support its continuance. The many positive features of the training that I personally received included such things as:

- the mentor relationship
- the Byers computer seminar
- joint research involvement
- individual research
- critique of personal writing
- the visiting scholar program

If asked to single out the most meaningful aspect of the program I would mention the visiting scholars; this is because an immediate bond is established when you have a minority role-model who brings an insight to the forum that adds an additional aspect of realism. Their experiences, the problems they solved, the pitfalls to avoid and the willingness to allow us to become members of a minority network provide a form of support that you feel you can always rely upon.

I think the built-in flexibility we had prevented any negative aspects of the program from becoming real problems. Our co-directors were always willing to negotiate and compromise with the post-docs and this made it possible to avoid major problems.

The MSU post doctoral year will always be regarded as a major benchmark in my career; the training, the friendships, the working relationships and the colleagues with whom I lived and worked so intimately will always engender fond memories. I am very pleased to have had the opportunity for the post-doctoral experience.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 3

I should like to begin this evaluation with a discussion of what this year in the post-doctoral program has meant to me, as my evaluation is from this perspective.

What the Program has Meant for Me

First, and perhaps most important, the program provided a model of how to do research in an academic setting. While graduate school provided the pieces necessary to do research, i.e., coursework in research methods and statistics, and guided practice in carrying out research projects, it was from the perspective of an isolated, individual effort. The environment of the practicing, academic scholar is quite different from that of a graduate student, however, with responsibilities for teaching, advising, and institutional committee work in addition to research. This post-doctoral program has provided a model of ways to accomplish excellence by exemplifying a cooperative, team approach to research activity and the sharing of profesional expertise. Even if returning to a situation where one's research efforts will remain largely individual, the model has shown the usefulness and effectiveness of seeking collegial feedback and input on reseach proposals and research reports, as well as experience in that process. Participation in this program has made it quite clear that research is accomplished by those who carve out and jealously guard their research and writing time.

Second, the post-doctoral program has reinforced my interest in focusing research in my discipline (telecommunication) in an educational and instructional application. My graduate work began with an interest in instructional television, and my cognate area of educaitonal foundations

prepared me for this research focus. The focus of colleagues in my department as well as the professional associations and journals in my field, however, is not in this area. The post-doctoral program has allowed me to make the contacts with educational researchers that are necessary to carry out the kind of instructional television research that I have been prepared and motivated to pursue.

Design of Future Projects

It is difficult to imagine how the effectiveness of the post-doctoral program might have been different without all of the components that were included. Having experienced the program it seems that they are all important, that each has contributed in a significant way, and that the value of each component is related to the others. I would recommend retaining, then, the mentor-post doctorate working relationship, the structured research seminars, the visiting scholars, the opportunity to attend professional conventions, the option of attending classes, and the social activities. The comments as to why each is valuable are highlights and certainly not meant to be exhaustive.

The mentor-post doctorate relationship provides an opportunity for a focus on research interests at an individual level. Mentors contributed guidance, expertise, and perspective to pursuing individual and particular research interests. The seminars, devoted to educational research methods, on the other hand, provided theoretical approaches, research designs, and research methods in general.

The seminar component served a number of valuable purposes. Those devoted to eduational research provided an opportunity to refine general research knowledge as well as identify scholars who could serve as

resources in future research activity. Those devoted to computer use refreshed knowledge of statistical procedures and provided opportunities to learn and practice new approaches to data analysis. Finally, seminars devoted to the presentation of post-doctoral research papers provided the opportunity for practice in presenting research and the experience of seeking and using input from colleagues.

The visiting scholar component of the program provided the perspective of a wider range of resources and a number of scholar models. Most importantly, however, it exemplified the effectiveness of national networking of scholars of similar research interests.

The opportunities to attend national research conventions provided further experience in recognizing and employing the concept of national contact with scholars of similar interests.

The opportunity to attend classes was useful to those participating in the program who wanted to develop new approaches to research. While I would recommend retaining this component of the program, it seems to me that the time commitment it requires should be carefully weighed by participants. It should be an adjunct to, not a major component of the year in residence.

Finally, the social activities with visiting scholars and researchers involved with the program were valuable in contributing to the perspective of a cooperative, collegial approach to research that the program exemplified.

Recommendations for future projects are reflective of the strengths of the experience I had with the current project. First, as suggested above, I would retain all of the components which have been a part of the program. This necessitates, of course, a residency program. I do not think that the

model for academic research provided by this program could be effectively transmitted in any other arrangement. One must become a participant in the day-to-day activities of a research group to learn the subtle and not-so-subtle way that things are accomplished. This is not the kind of information that can be learned from books, lectures, or seminars. It has to be experienced.

Two suggestions for improvement reflect a refining of the program rather than major changes: (1) the mentor-post doctorate relationship and (2) structure of the second year.

The value of the mentor-post doctorate relationship might be improved by a more structured approach both in the selection of a mentor and in the monitoring of the relationship. Problems in selecting mentors seemed to occur because information on current research projects was not provided. Instead, post doctorates were given an indication of general research interests, some of which was ambiguous and some of which was not reflected in current research projects. In addition, prospective mentors did not seem to understand the nature of the post doctorate-mentor relationship. These two factors made it difficult for the participants unfamiliar with the mentor resources or with the program to negotiate a meaningful mentor-post doctorate relationship.

I would recommend that the directors of the program do the following to expedite the formation of the mentor-post doctorate relationship: (1) clearly explain the objectives of the relationship to prospective faculty mentors; (2) ascertain which among the faculty are willing to work with a post doctorate fellow; (3) provide a description of current research projects or interests of those faculty willing to work with a post doctorate fellow; (4) provide a list of research interests of the post

doctorates to the prospective mentors. Prospective mentors should be able to initiate the relationship as easily as the participant might. It ought to be a negotiated relationship based on information from both sources. Mentors did not seem as committed as they might have been, and as is necessary for this most important component of the program.

The structure of the second year of the program is not well specified. It should be clear to mentors and post doctorates alike what the expectations of this second phase of the program are. The year in residence was a very important beginning, but it does not seem likely that many who have left the program will continue as well as they might if there were guided expectations for the second year. Similarly, I am not really sure that mentors feel any responsibility for the kind of feedback and suggestions that post doctorates might need in the second year. Finally, it is not clear which of the resources of the IRT are available to post doctorates after they have left the year of residency. It could be a very valuable part of the program, but it is the ambiguity makes it almost a non-component.

As stated above, these suggestions for changes are refinements to a very well designed and directed program. The sincere enthusiasm of the directors was certainly evident, and the resources provided were excellent. People having the opportunity to participate in the program were indeed fortunate.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 4

There are two components to the formal post doctoral program that I think were most useful: 1) the mentor-mentee relationship; and 2) the visiting scholars. The mentor-mentee model provided the post doctoral fellows with the opportunity to develop close working relationships with leading educational researchers, In addition to learning a great deal about some of the more standard aspects of research, e.g., data collection, analysis and dissemination, the mentee was also able to benefit from the mentor's expertise in some of the more informal aspects of research. This includes time management, assorted organizational and administrative skills and the delegation of responsibility. The development of these skills is particularly useful in conducting large scale research projects.

The visiting scholars component of the program was also beneficial in a variety of ways. Its most far reaching impact is the expansion of the post doctoral fellows professional network to include a number of nationally known researchers. I personally have had the opportunity to work with and maintain contact with a couple of the visiting scholars, and it is doubtful that this kind of relationship could have been established without the post doctoral experience.

The visiting scholars also provide the post doctoral fellow with professional role models that in many ways share their backgrounds, values and view of the educational research enterprise. In general, the visiting scholars have met and overcome many of the obstacles to professional growth and development that the post doctoral fellows are now encountering. Their accumulated wisdom, knowledge and expertise can provide the post doctoral fellow with not only inspiration but also practical alternatives to solving problems.

Another more formal aspect of the program was the trip to the AERA conference (Boston 1980). Two things happened on that trip that made me reassess my perception of professional meetings and realize the importance of that kind of experience. First of all, after experiencing my first AERA conference, I was no longer in awe of those who were fortunate to present papers. I came away with the feeling that I could produce work just as good (and in many cases better) as what I had seen presented.

The second revelation at my first AERA conference was the recognition that this was a setting in which a great deal of professional networking took place. The opportunity to strengthen past ties and develop new ones was clearly as beneficial to one's career as the presentation of a professional paper.

One aspect of my participation in the program from which I benefitted considerably, but was not structured in, was my interaction with Dr. Joe Byers. The opportunity to design a project with another post doctoral fellow, collect the data and then analyze the data with Dr. Byer's assistance was definitely one of the highlights of the program. After working with him, I really felt that my quantitative skills had been enhanced considerably.

There are a couple of aspects of the program that I feel could have been considerably modified. I think the seminars between the program directors and the post doctoral fellows could have been shortened and made a little less formal. Although I did not object to the writing assignments, I think they should have been concerned with a more defined long-term purpose (e.g., publication). The net result was one in which a kind of "graduate student identity" developed among the post doctoral fellows and some felt that they were not being treated as colleagues.

Finally, I think more effort should have been expended "up front" to make sure that the post doctoral fellows were thoroughly familiar with the current work of potential mentors. Brief telephone conversations with two or three potential mentors would probably have been sufficient.

All in all, the post doctoral program provided me with an excellent transition from my role as a faculty member in predominantly teaching oriented colleges to a full time research position at an educational R & D institution. Soon I will be joining the faculty of a large university where I will have the opportunity to pursue my own research interests. I am sure that I will always look back at my participation in the Post Doctoral Program for Women and Minorities in Educational Research as a significant turning point in my career.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 5

The field of educational research does not suffer from the paucity of research efforts and research contributions but rather from the lack of meaningful, relevant research. Research that explains the obvious to concerned educators is considered meaningless in most areas and many times is discounted as another exercise in educational futility. Respectable research then is described as qualitative/quantatative in nature, able to withstand external scrutiny, explainable, has practical applicability and is replicable. The post doctoral training program covers the areas outlined above in addition to other areas.

The post doctoral program endeavors to impart skills in research to that population of educators who have expressed concern about research results thought unfavorable to them. Usually this research is not undertaken by this population and the results are questioned due to inherent subjectivity. The assumptions expanded here suggested that individuals constructing hypotheses about individuals with their backgrounds would look at different variables which may cause the research results to differ in favor of those researched. This is important where policy implications are the outcome of such research.

To have educational research be meaningful for all educators, a continued focus on minorities and women should continue at two levels: the researched and the researcher. This can be accomplished through a dedicated effort to develop competent researchers from this population. The post doctoral program has endeavored to achieve these ends through a program designed with many components. Among them are introduction to technical writing, working with mentors, seminars in research design and analysis, seminars and topics on types of research, availability of

materials and books, and computer access. The availability and guidance of the program directors has been invaluable, as well as the total organization and attention to minute details of the program. The opportunity to attend an AERA conference may have been one highlight of the program. The opportunity to meet established researchers, gather papers and become acquainted with researchers across the country can only be exceeded by a first publication in a refereed journal. Finally, the visiting scholars offered the opportunity of free exchange at a level almost commensurate with research-mentor relationship.

In my application for the post doctoral program, I expressed the initial desire to research specific areas of special education. I focused on questions relative to teacher-decision to nominate certain children for special education. While this question is currently under scrutiny, it has become clear that the scope of educational research is much broader and as a result, my interest has broadened to include many other areas. Among those areas are teacher attitudes toward the least restrictive environment (mainstreaming), predictions of student teacher behaviors (teacher effectiveness), preventive mental health, placement of children in special education programs, literature used in teacher preparation in the behaviorally disordered in colleges and universities across the country, and a proposal to study current trends in the behaviorally disordered.

Through research and writing, I attempted to attain the skills necessary to answer some questions I had regarding research design and writing. Much of the data has been collected and analyzed to address issues in the research listed in the preceeding paragraph.

The program for the preparation of teachers for the behaviorally disordered will be enhanced with the addition of my post doc research

skills. Further, I feel priviledged to be added to the growing list of minority researchers in the country.

The design of the present program leaves room for additions or deletions and the ones I am suggesting may be easily accomplished without major structural changes.

An earlier orientation would facilitate trainees' adjustment to the campus, mentor selection and program expectation. Two weeks of orientation may allow trainees to adequately process materials and routines prior to beginning of seminars.

An earlier writing sample should be required and critiqued by the group. Deadlines cause most people to focus on production earlier in the program, and early assignments would emphasize the reality and necessity of production. Joint research among the post-doc's should be encouraged as this is valued in the overall research program.

Consultants from public school systems should be included to add a measure of realism relative to research application in schools.

Post doctoral trainees should write a proposal for funding with each person responsible for a particular section. The writing of this proposal would give the group skill in proposal writing, develop a spirit of cohesion and if funded, could be left at the host university.

Deletion of seminars designed to review proposals should be practiced, since this could be done on a case by case basis to enhance the skills of those requesting the same.

Scheduling of trips to other programs may be deleted and replaced by attendance at research conferences (AERA, State AERA, post doctoral conferences, etc.), as the personnel staffing these programs present at major conferences anyway.

Again, the program is able to stand on its own merits and leaves little room for improvement.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 6

I am writing to express, formally, my sincere gratitude to you both for the assistance, support and interest extended to me as a fellow in the research program.

Perhaps the value of the program can be most appreciated after one has had some distance from it and can evaluate the impact of the experience over time. In that respect, I am even more grateful, because I now find myself referring to the experience in almost every aspect of my professional experiences.

While I am not totally involved in research at the present time, I have had the opportunity to work on several different projects since the program and I keep involved in as many ways that I can with the research programs that were in my interest area. This is increasing and I have attracted a couple of grants to the counseling center...Not big ones, but certainly a start for an independent provider of services.

Perhaps the greatest gain that was personal for me was to become knowledgeable about minority researchers engaged in research on and for minorities. This knowledge about minority researchers has been very productive for me in many ways.

Well, anyway, to you both, please accept my sincere thanks for the opportunity and exposure that I have been given. I believe I have just begun a new facet of my search for being effective in this world, in some significant way. I plan to find the place soon.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 7

Selections of mentors, and the projects on which the post doc works are the two factors that most concern me. I would have liked to have first found out who worked with which project, which would have given me an idea of the interests of the individual and secondly would have provided me with the information on the type and nature of the project. Thus, if information on mentors and projects was given at the start of the program it would be more feasible for the post doc to make a choice on the project mentors after taking into account all that may be available to him or her.

Another area of difficulty was the lack of time to do individual writing. Once the post doc was halfway through the program s/he was ready to put some of her/his work on paper. There was very little time to do that. If more time was available, it would have been more feasible to have some papers finalized and maybe submitted for publication. I would have preferred to see more effort directed to getting papers finalized and submitted to journals. A part of the classwork may have been critiquing peer papers. A token attempt was made in this direction during my year of participation, but that was insufficient. Every post doc had her/his work to be done with the result the need to go through another's work was neglected because of lack of time.

Instruction in the use of the computer was very helpful. The visiting scholars were experts in their respective fields, which was also an encouragement to the post docs and the classes conducted for the post docs by the MSU personnel were very effective, e.g., the writing project by Janet.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 8

The post doctoral research experience at Michigan State University provided an opportunity for extensive study in the field of educational research. The year was rewarding and very profitable for me. First of all, the program's design insured that each fellow was literally immersed in research from the very beginning. Seminars generally held three days a week provided an opportunity to discuss a number of related topics including technical writing, grants and proposal writing, research design, statistics, and applications of computers and canned programs. The seminars also provided an opportunity to present research, obtain feedback and critique other's research and proposals. The seminars will, I believe, prove to be one of the two most valuable components of the training.

The fact that the program was practical, applied, and research-based was the other most beneficial feature of the training. Fellows were provided opportunities to work either on their own projects or collaborate with other researchers and faculty in the Institute. The time provided to work on research started during the last three years was especially beneficial for me. Since I was an administrator with teaching responsibilities, there never seemed to be enough time to work on research projects. I now believe that I have the momentum as well as additional skills needed to be productive. I have also decided that I want to devote a larger proportion of my time and efforts to research and have arranged to reduce my administrative responsibilities at Bowling Green State University in order to accomplish this during the coming year.

The post doctoral program provided an opportunity to establish relationships and make contacts with other persons who have interests in similar areas of research. It is hoped that a network consisting of

participants and other persons involved in the training as mentors and visiting scholars will evolve as a positive consequence of the training activities.

It was very obvious that a great deal of planning went into the development of research training for post doctorals. I believe the resident year program was well-conceived and well-executed. I have no major recommendations that would be helpful in designing future programs since the MSU model could well be a prototype for future efforts. The second year program is the only area in which additional thought and planning could facilitate achievement of program goals and objectives. With the exception of individuals who continue to be associated with Michigan State, there seems to be little or no follow-through during the second year. Thus, some of the momentum already established is abruptly ended with the expiration of the residential program. This is a pertinent issue only because the original proposal refers to a second year program and because the first year program is quite inclusive and many good research projects are identified and initiated but not completed. Perhaps the desired continuity could be achieved by redefining the mentor relationship. More importantly, the considerable resources of the host university could also be made available to fellows during the second year. This would be especially important to individuals working at institutions that are not major research centers. For many of us, the year ended before we were able to fully capitalize upon the new or enhanced skills and knowledge--particularly in the areas of computer utilization and data analysis.

Much of the potential will, in my opinion, still be realized, however. The full effect of the program was not limited to the enhancement of

research skills. It also impacted upon our attitudes about research, gave us new confidence and filled us with an appreciation for research and an urgency to complete our own projects. These intangibles should, under any circumstances, result in increased productivity during the coming year.

I do feel, however, that major support should not be terminated with the end of the residential program and that the second year, as implied in the original proposal, is a very important component of the total training package. It should be considered as the logical next step where fellows, working independently on specific research projects, still have access to resources and expertise of persons at the host institution. This is not likely to occur, in a meaningful way, unless it is built into the program with appropriate support provided.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 9

As I reflect on the Post-Doc training experience, I remember that my first source of gratification was to learn that NIE had made a substantial financial commitment to increasing the number of minority research scholars in the country. This move, I felt, not only facilitated a more complete use of the nation's human resources but it also expanded the nature of the dialogue that occurs within the education community, especially as it relates to social and academic learning patterns of minority children. Concomitantly, I was delighted to learn that Michigan State University had been selected to serve as one of the training laboratories.

It was on the personal level, however, that I found myself most moved by the total training experience. The Institute for Research on Teaching, working in conjunction with the College of Education, had managed to assemble the critical mass of compatible personalities, (rich in a broad array of knowledge and skills) that is necessary to create an environment which is both technically satisfying and emotionally inspiring. While the technical support was ubiquitous, the sources of inspiration came in more selected form. The first dramatic source appeared during an introductory meeting with Dean Judy Lanier. She was warm and engaging in her presentation, but more importantly, she appeared candid and thoroughly committed to the principle of "equity" in her personal and professional life (which I was able to confirm subsequently). Dean Lanier's statements did not contain the empty verbalism that so often characterize administrators who are obligated to address an issue that is frought with moral and legal implications. Her comments were supported by actions which carried a clear message, "I behave the way I do because it is expected and I believe it is fair." As a Post-Doc scholar new to MSU, I found her

leadership style to be extremely refreshing. Not only was she competent, but she was trustworthy.

Dr. Andrew Porter quickly emerged as another unique personality in a constellation of academic excellence. In spite of his eminent roles and inherent power, Andy's initial description of the Institute for Research on Teaching (an organization in which the Post-Docs would become involved) with its novel design of shared responsibilities and opportunities for influence casted him in the role of a very sophisticated and secure administrator. It suggested that he knew how to induce the maximum creativity and productivity from his colleagues (through shared authority and responsibility) without being threatened by their diverse inputs. This shared authority did not go unnoticed while Andy served as a co-director of the Post-Doc Program for Minorities and Women with Jackie Nickerson, a black female. Andy's capacity to maintain and promote these organizational and procedural arrangements signified to me that he would be able to champion my needs as a minority scholar with the same zeal with which he took on his other responsibilities.

Dr. Nickerson was the other member of the administrative troika and was unquestionably one of the personalities that made the experience so thoroughly satisfying. In fact, Jackie was my initial contact and managed to convince me of the program's merits while I was visiting the campus on another matter. During the short time available between her scheduled appointments, she was able to dissuade me from pursuing a post-doc program on the west coast and to further explore the services at MSU. Early in the program, Jackie demonstrated an uncanny ability to help the participants formulate training goals that were within the broad sphere of the program framework, and yet they were formulated on an individualized and

personalized basis. The grace with which she helped to formulate these initial training goals paralleled the artistry with which she guided participants toward potential "mentors." Dr. Nickerson was able to facilitate these contacts without the tremendous emotional "fallout" that occasionally erupts from such interpersonal explorations. While I always appreciated Jackie's technical skills and her ability to administrate/coordinate the myriad of activities associated with the program, my greatest source of satisfaction was derived from her personal commitment to our development. Unlike some of the personnel employed in other large organizations, Jackie made me feel as though my growth was important to her--and that she would (and did) make time to address my needs. However, it should be noted that while Jackie was very generous with her time and advice, she possessed the intuition to know when a trainee was emotionally in need of cotton soft stroking, or prodding from a velvet harpoon. In either case, she always provided the necessary service with a clear sense that the action taken was done with the trainee's best interest in mind.

It may appear that I have dwelled excessively on the personalities associated with the Post-Doc program, although it is my intention to merely be emphatic in this specific area. I am thoroughly convinced that the key personalities, as they comprise the leadership core in an organization are the most important element in the system. There may be other universities around the country with fine libraries, computer systems, allied institutes and programs, but in my opinion, there are very few that can match the material resources combined with the quality and style of leadership that contribute more directly to the collegial participation of staff and advanced students than occurs in this setting, especially in the IRT.

While my specific comments have focused on personnel involved with administrative responsibilities, there are numerous others who share their basic qualities of concern and commitment. These personnel would include my "mentor," Jere Brophy; Joe Byers, the director of the Office for Research Consultation; Larry Lezotte, who proved to be a source of support whenever needed, and there were many others.

Among the program benefits that I valued most highly, which include the opportunities to be trained by some of the most competent researchers in the country, is the exposure to exciting role models. These models are not limited to the cadre of scholars at MSU but also include many of the visiting Black scholars. While selected attributes of the MSU faculty have been mentioned, it is important for me to direct attention to the uniqueness of the Black scholars. One subtle but significant characteristic is that most of them did not become researchers through a series of planned events--but through happenstance. This lack of sequential experiences to produce quality researchers has policy implications for producing future Black scholars. It clearly suggests the need for more high level support and guidance to assure development of an adequate pool of minority researchers.

Another characteristic of the Black models is that many of them are employed, or have been employed, by minority institutions. These experiences are in marked contrast to my own and provide me with much insight regarding critical features of minority institutions, e.g., student body, faculty support, work loads, etc., in addition to the variance in politics between majority and minority universities.

An additional dimension of the Black models is the focus of their work. These scholars are all pursuing answers to questions directly

related to the education of minority youngsters. I find this to be extremely exciting because a) minority problems did not receive much consideration in my previous experiences and b) it provided me with direct access to scholars and specific works which were highly relevant to my interest. In brief, the MSU and visiting scholars were complementary; both provided me with the substance and the identification that I have long sought in academic communities.

In terms of the program design and content, I have been extremely pleased and would recommend retention of the basic structure. Each component offered a discrete service, I felt. For example, the "Pro-seminar" served as a home base, in addition to being a setting where conceptual and evaluation skills were honed. One modification that may improve the general utility of this seminar would be to spend more time critiquing studies and reviewing methods of analysis, e.g., identifying several potential methods and briefly discussing the merits of each relative to the problem being investigated. This procedure would be most appropo during the second semester, after the trainees have spent an intial period of time critiquing the research of their peers, visiting scholars, or IRT staff. An additional comment regarding the "Pro-seminar" would be to maintain the option of negotiating meeting periods during the third term. In the past this procedure proved to be extremely practical for it allowed the trainees to use their time in the most productive manner feasible.

The "mentor" concept and its implementation worked extremely well for me, and I view it as being critical to the program for it enabled each trainee to work in a compatible area with an outstanding researcher. In my experience, Jere Brophy was not only compatible in his professional

interest and activities, but was very generous in allowing me to participate in his research projects as a vehicle to increase my learning. Furthermore, it was Jere who provided me with immense guidance in conceptualizing the research proposal which I developed (and received funding) while still in the Post-Doc Program. I feel that this kind of "mentor" support exemplifies the potential benefits of the "mentor" relationship.

The "research seminar" with Joe Byers was excellent and I recommend that it retain its current form. I found Professor Byers to be an extremely talented teacher who possessed the experience and personal flexibility to accommodate the instructional needs and interest of a highly diverse group--while maintaining a generous sense of humor.

There are two areas of the program that I would like to see substantially modified. One is the relationship with Morgan State University. As a Black scholar, the visitation to a historically Black institution was very gratifying. Yet, it seems that if minority Post-Docs are going to maximize their potential for growth, they need the opportunity to interact with minority scholars on an extensive or frequent basis. This need raises a desire to examine the feasibility of developing a closer working relationship with Morgan. Perhaps it could include: some of the trainees spending a block of time on the Morgan campus; joint or collaborative research activities between Post Docs and Morgan faculty, and/or a faculty exchange arrangement. Additionally, I would like to encourage the visitation to more than one minority campus as a means to acquire a clearer grasp of minority issues and campus political life.

The second area that I recommend for change is the "expected" attendance at the Thursday Colloquium Series. While the substance of these

presentations may have value for some trainees, it certainly is not uniform. This time may be used more profitably in other activities.

There are numerous benefits that have derived from participation in the program which I would like to identify. They include:

a) a greater knowledge of research design and analysis,
b) improved skills in computer technology and usage,
c) further development of evaluation skills,
d) a broader grasp of research literature in my own area of interest--social behavior disorders,
e) a better understanding of Black colleges and their unique problems,
f) an extended affiliation with minority and non-minority researchers,
g) a clearer definition of my research interest, and
h) a more thorough awareness of the measures required to promote my interest.

As a result of these growth experiences, I feel that I am better prepared to take part in the professional community and I have been involved in a variety of activities since entering the Post-Doc Program. Examples of the more significant events are:

a) serving as a consultant to the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services/U.S. Department of Education;

b) writing three proposals. One has been funded ("Race, Culture, and Teacher Recommendation"). The other two are under review ("Effective Schools for Emotionally Disturbed Black Students" and "Models of Evaluation Procedures for Mentally Retarded Minority Students.");

c) collaborating with experienced researchers (participated in a study with Jere Brophy and developed proposals with Larry Lezotte and Ronald Edmonds).

d) serving:

   1) on the Planning Committee for the National Topical Conference and Institute Series on Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Youth, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 1981 & 1982;

   2) as Council for Behavior Disorders Delegate Assembly Representative to the International Council for Exceptional Children, April, 1982;

   3) as Chairperson, Ad Hoc Committee for Minority Affairs, Council for Behavior Disorders, C.E.C., 1981;

4) as Executive Board Member - Council for Behavior Disorders, C.E.C, 1982.

e) presenting papers or serving as session leader which include:

"School Suspension of Minority Children: A Problem in Effective Programming." Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children, Conference on the Exceptional Black Child, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 15-17, 1981.

"Critical Issues in Delivery of Services to Behavioral Disordered Minority Youth." Position Paper of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children, Conference on the Exceptional Black Child, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 15-17, 1981.

"Conflict Management at Home and School." A workshop presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention. Program of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. New York, New York, April, 1981.

In summary, I have found the Post-Doc Program for Minorities and Women to be extremely exciting and beneficial. It is my sincere hope that NIE and other funding agencies will continue to sponsor programs of this kind in settings which demonstrate the level of competence and concern displayed at MSU.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 10

I eagerly respond to your invitation to assess the design of the post-doctoral program relative to my personal experiences as a program participant. I believe that a careful examination of my experiences, at both a personal and institutional level, raises a number of serious questions about the adequacy of the program in meeting proposed goals. As implied by the title, "New Paths Toward Research Leadership for Minorities and Women," the original proposal recognizes that "new paths" are called for if honest attempts are to be made to break down the institutional barriers and compensate for the sociological and cultural influences that combine to dissuade minorities and women from seeking professions in educational research. Specific to the paper, tracing the recent rejection of my bid for reappointment and tenure at MSU highlights the need to focus affirmative action efforts on breaking down standardized institutional procedures that fail to accommodate to the unique circumstances of individual candidates.

I believe that the training I received from my mentor was outstanding and was, for me, the strongest component of the post-doctoral program. This relationship, however, needs to be carefully examined in light of several institutionally negative effects. As an entering fellow, I had, by definition, limited experience in, and knowledge of, research methodology. While the proposal states that a "superior-subordinate relationship between mentor and fellow will not be present or tolerated," further references in the proposal describe the role of the mentor as "supervising" the fellow's "hands on" experiences in conducting education research. In addition, the proposal states that "in all cases, writing will be done under the supervision of the mentor" (emphasis added). The combined effect of

limited entering knowledge, and a supervisory model as the basis for the fellow/mentor relationship represents, I believe, the most serious vulnerability of the program. Webster's definition of supervise has the connotation (all the way from its Latin etymology) of overseeing, directing, i.e., having primary responsibility for an underling, one less-than, one not-yet initiated. I am not arguing that this supervisory model was inappropriate at the beginning of the relationship with my mentor. What is important is that the relationship moved steadily toward what I will refer to as "consulting" model. This model carries with it the connotation of deliberation and thoughtfulness between two people who come together to seek a perspective. While I believe that my mentor and I have been highly successful in effecting this necessary transition, I believe that the institution has failed to recognize its significance.

Insensitivity of the institution to this development pattern resulted in a lack of recognition that productivity (or lack of), in a consultative relationship of this sort, cannot be easily ascribed to either individual. The issue of productivity is further complicated by institutional distinctions between "writing" and "authorship." In academic parlance, the term "writer" suggests the person who puts ideas on paper while "author" implies one who originates. If the institution views all joint relationships as the product of a supervisory relationship, rather than a consultative relationship, the fellow is excluded from any ownership for production, credit for accomplishment and ultimately progress in the profession.

At a general level, the use of mentors needs to be more thoroughly investigated particularly in programs such as this one where an enormous status differential exists between the pool of primarily professional,

aspiring white, male mentors and the fellow pool of minorities and women. The relationship has the potential of being harmful to the fellow, particularly if the mentor is a power seeker who credits himself with the fellow's accomplishments in much the same way as some parents credit themselves for their childrens' accomplishments rather than measuring their success in terms of a child's ability to achieve independence.

An understanding of this issue is particularly essential in assessing my situation because of two unique circumstances. First, the relationship between my mentor and me has been an unusually close and, I believe, productive one. I insisted early in the relationship that I be included in all phases of his research work and was committed to gaining as much "hands on" experience as I possibly could. This close relationship, however, was viewed by some people in the organization as a dependence on my mentor. This view is a misinterpretation of the relationship which resulted from a lack of understanding of the distinction between supervision and consultation. Because I remain at MSU, continuing to work closely with my mentor, my "graduation" from the program was never dramatically apparent. This effect was compounded by the fact that my previous assignment was off campus where I had no clearly established institutional identity for campus personnel before I entered the program.

Second, time became a critical factor because of the immediate need to demonstrate productivity for promotion and tenure considerations. The question of product ownership became a central concern during the transitional period (supervising/consultation) in our mentor/fellow relationship. Returning to the parent/child analogy, this transition can be compared to the struggles between adolescents and parents as each stuggle to redefine their role. Add to this the fact that my mentor was

simultaneously being called on to evaluate me relative to administrative standards and his ambivalance is understandable.

What is not understandable to me is that, although the institution targeted me for affirmative action in mid-career renewal, no efforts were made to identify and rectify the institutional barriers that have now been imposed to exclude me from practicing my new skills within the sponsoring institution. If "training" is the only obligation of the program then it is nothing more than a compensatory education program--possession of new skills is simply not enough if the "paths" to practicing these skills are closed. When I was accepted as a post-doctoral fellow with institutional sponsorship, I committed myself to a new direction in my profession as part of a larger commitment to the institution's increasing focus on research and scholarship. I have worked hard to prepare myself to be competitive in these two areas. I believe, based both on my own assessment and on the feedback of others, that I have demonstrated more potential for outstanding work than might reasonably be expected in such a short time.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 11

Periodic assessments of the state of elementary and secondary schools, as well as institutions of higher learning in the U.S., have identified an array of problems related to various aspects of education. The educational research community which has traditionally assumed the burden of addressing some of these problems has been described as having under representation of minorities and women.

Since much of the research that has addressed educational problems has reported findings specifically directed to females and minority groups, widespread concern has developed both within and outside the research community regarding the low percentage of researchers from these designated groups.

My own experiences as a natural science educator in higher education in the capacity of teacher and administrator in both majority (University of Pittsburgh and Oklahoma State University) and minority (Morgan) institutions have made me acutely aware of significant problems in the teaching and learning of science. Most of my years of experience have been at Morgan State University where emphasis has been placed on teaching and little or no time has been available for research which could address some of the identified problems.

I was indeed encouraged to learn of the Michigan State University Post Doctoral Training Program in Educational Research for Women and Minorities. My site visit to MSU before acceptance into the program led me to believe that this was an opportunity for a degree of personal development which would enable me to contribute to the handling of the problems.

My tenure as a fellow in the program during the 1980-81 academic year certainly fulfilled my expectations. As a result of my training at MSU, I

consider myself equipped with the basic skills necessary to enable me to become one of the educational researchers that contributes to the knowledge base concerning some of the problems of education that pertain specifically to minorities.

In retrospect, I review the MSU training period to have had two major divisions, one part structured, and the other non-structured. The structured aspect, I would divide as follows:

1. Resident Researchers
    a. Research design
    b. Review of research methods
    c. The know how of getting published
    d. The obligation to publish
2. IRT Staff
    a. Manuscript preparation
    b. Proposal development
    c. Funding opportunities
    d. The know how of getting funded
3. The use of computer programming in educational research
4. Visiting scholars
5. Attendance at professional meetings
6. Formal instruction opportunity
7. Research activity
8. Interaction among post docs
    a. Exchange of research ideas
    b. Exchange of professional experiences
    c. Opportunity for reports on progress of ongoing research

(Note: a and b above were accomplished during the non-structured component.)

The non-structured part of the program included the following:

1. Interaction with a chosen mentor
2. Individual pursuit of library research and writing activity

In all honesty I would not have been willing to give up any part of the structured component. However, I don't think there was enough time for adequate library research and writing activities.

I would recommend that future training programs be extended to a two year period, and that the training be more tailored to the individual's needs and level of skill development upon entry into the program. The first year then could be devoted to readings, basic skill development, and mentor interaction. During the second year the heavy schedule of structured research would be used.

Post Doctoral Program Evaluation Statement - 12

Any remarks about my participation and experiences in the post-doctoral research program must be viewed in light of my part-time status. However, that part-time status in no way detracted from my interest and willingness to be a part of the program. In fact, I wish that I could have been a part of it on a full-time basis.

Regardless of the above I honestly feel the merits of the program, personally speaking, far outweigh my reduced access to it. Consequently, I offer the following recommendations:

1. That an attempt be made to involve as potential mentors, those who are currently involved in research and/or who have specific research needs that would enable fellows to take an active role in it from day one.

2. That fellows have information about mentor research needs (not interests) prior to active participation in the program.

3. That efforts be made to incorporate a more diverse sample of potential mentors, and hence research interests, that would be available to fellows.

4. The colloquia be designed, or scheduled, that teach, as well as present, research ideas, problems and methodologies.

As a part of the first post-doctoral cohort group some of the above may have been accomplished as of this mini-conference.

My personal experiences, I believe, have helped me to sustain my interest in research and to carry through with some of the ideas and projects that I developed in the program. In addition, the idea of the mini-conference has served as a reaffirmation of the need for minorities and women to continue writing and researching. I would hope that a network of the fellows be aided to continue maintaining access to one another via research and professional interests.

Appendix C

POST DOCTORAL MINI-CONFERENCE AGENDA

POST DOCTORAL MINI-CONFERENCE

May 19-21, 1982

Institute for Research
on Teaching

Michigan State University

Lodging: University Inn
1100 Trowbridge
East Lansing
Phone: 351-5500

(For Transportation to Erickson meet in motel lobby at 8:40 a.m.)

Wednesday, May 19

a.m. Visit with Mentors

1:00-4:00 p.m. Post doctoral research interchange (20 minute presentations followed by ten minute question/discussion period).
Room 452
Erickson

1:00 p.m. Lonnie Mc Intyre - "Longitudinal Study of the Factors that Effect School Learning Climate."

1:30 p.m. Jacqueline Reed - "Educational Projects & Programs."

2:00 p.m. Flavio Vega - "Evaluation of Human Relations Education: The Minnesota Experience."

2:30 p.m. Esther Ridley - "Ethnographic Study of Elementary Science Program."

3:00 p.m. Gretchen Barbatsis - "Research Framework for Investigating Pictorial Literacy."

3:30 p.m. Martha Warfield - "Educational Policies and Equitable Education: A Report of Studies of Two Desegregated Systems."

Thursday, May 20

Room 318 Erickson

9:00 a.m. Gene Pernell - "Prediction of Student-Teacher Behavior-A Replication."

9:30 a.m. Aban Darwalla - "Determining Prerequisites for A.F.T Students in Quartermaster School."

10:00 a.m. Jacqueline Caul - "Equity Issues in Teacher Development."

10:30 a.m. John Newby - "Survey of Academic Support Programs in Mid-western States."

Thursday, May 20

11:00 a.m. Stella Hargett - "Desegregation and Black Student Attrition in Higher Education"

1:30 p.m. Jane Enty - "Field Research in Clothing Behavior."

2:00 p.m. Gordon Fooks - "Report on Current Projects."

2:30 p.m. Joe Price - "Common Areas of Misconceptions Regarding the Education of Black Children: A Synthesis."

3:00 p.m. Hakim Rashid - "From Pre-School to Young Adult: Case Studies in Black Child Development."

8:00 p.m. Get Together

Jackie Nickerson's
2400 Post Oak Lane
Phone: 372-0977

Friday, May 21

Room 507 Erickson

9:00-11:00 a.m. Visiting Scholar - Dr. Andrew Billingsley,
President Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD

11:45 a.m. Luncheon Meeting - Room C - University Club - Lower Level

Appendix D

DIRECTORY OF POST DOCTORAL

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

DIRECTORY

OF

PARTICIPANTS

Post-Doctoral Program in Educational Research
for
Minorities and Women

September 1979
December 1982
Co-Directors - Jacquelyn R. Nickerson
Andrew C. Porter

Institute for Research

on

Teaching

College of Education
Michigan State University

Directory of Participants

CO-DIRECTORS

Jacquelyn R. Nickerson
201H Erickson Hall
College of Education
Michigan State University
E. Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 353-9761

Andrew Porter
319 Erickson Hall
College of Education
Michigan State University
E. Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 353-5091

Post Doctoral Fellows
Institute for Research on Teaching
Michigan State University

1979-80 Fellows (1st Cohort)	Address	Institution at the time of post doctoral program participation	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Jacqueline Caul	554 Foxboro Sq. Brighton, MI 48116	Michigan State University	Dr. William Schmidt	Application of Statistical Models in Research Studies
Dr. Gordon Fooks	399 Circlewood Ln. Wyoming, OH 45215	Michigan State University	Dr. Phil Cusic	Field Study Research Methods of Vocational Education Related to Blacks
Dr. Hakim Rashid	1171 McIntyre Ann Arbor, MI 48105	Howard University	Dr. Jere Brophy	Research on Teaching and Early Childhood Education
Dr. Jacqueline Reed	1225 S. Euclid St. NW Washington D.C. 20009	University of Wisconsin	Dr. Fred Erickson	Qualitative Methods of Research related to Black Student Attrition in Higher Education
Dr. Martha Warfield	402 Norway Kalamazoo, MI	Kalamazoo College	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research Related to School Climate Factors in Desegregated Schools
1980-81 Fellows (2nd Cohort)				
Dr. Aban Daruwalla	3607B Portsmouth Hopewell, VA 23860	Shelby State College	Dr. Don Freeman Dr. Bob Floden	Research Related to Policy Capturing of Teachers in Determining Topics to be Taught in Classrooms
Dr. Stella Hargett	604 Elm Clovercrest Way Cockeysville, MD 21030	Morgan State University	Dr. Larry Lezotte Dr. Joe Darden	Research Related to Teacher Efficacy and Research Related to the Development of Professional Self-Concept of Black Student Teachers
Dr. Lonnie McIntyre	358 Erickson Hall East Lansing, MI 48823	Michigan State University	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research Related to School Climate in Desegregated Schools

Post Doctoral Fellows
Institute for Research on Teaching
Michigan State University

1980-81

Fellows (2nd Cohort)	Address	Institution	Mentor	Area of Collaboration
Dr. Joe Price	812 Carbeck Dr. Ann Arbor, MI 48103	University of Michigan	Dr. Jere Brophy	Research Related to School Discipline and Research Related to Disproportionate Numbers of Minority Children in Special Educational Programs
Dr. Esther Ridley	Morgan State University Baltimore, MD 21239	Morgan State University	Dr. Perry Lanier	Research Related to the Study of Black Students in the Elementary Science Classroom

1981-82

Fellows (3rd Cohort)				
Dr. Gretchen Barbatsis	1623 Colorado Dr. East Lansing, MI 48823	Michigan State University	Dr. Linda Anderson Dr. Lee Shulman	Research on Teaching Research on Telecommunication
Dr. Jane Enty	1420 Walker Ave. Baltimore, MD 21239	Morgan State University	Dr. Fred Erickson	Research on Intercultural Behavior Related to dress
Dr. John Newby	937 Country Club Dr. Bowling Green, OH 43402	Bowling Green University	Dr. Wilbur Brookover	Research on Educational Implications of Desegregation
Dr. Gene Pernell	1941 Brandywine East Lansing, MI 48823	Michigan State University	Dr. Larry Lezotte Dr. Ron Edmonds	Research on Effective Schools and Research on Teachers Practices Related to Special Education
Dr. Flavio Vega	1139 Ebeling Dr. South Bend, IN 46615	University of Iowa		Research on Policy Related to Educational Equity

96

Visiting Scholars

1979-80 Fall Quarter	Research Topics
Dr. Jean Carew (deceased) Standford University Boystown Center for Youth Development	Cognitive and Social Development of Young Children
Dr. Edmund Gordon Yale University	Research on Compensatory Education, Program Evaluation and Inequality in the U.S.
1979-80 Winter Quarter	
Dr. William Hall Department of Psychology University of Maryland College Park	Language Acquisition of Young Black Children
Dr. Phillip Carey Director - Institute for Urban Research Morgan State University	Research on Minority Student Retention in Higher Education
1979-80 Spring Quarter	
Dr. Asa Hilliard Callaway Professor of the Department of Educational Foundations Georgia State University	Aptitude and Achievement Testing
Dr. Edgar Epps University of Chicago	Research on Effects of School Desegregation
1980-81 Fall Quarter	
Professor Ron Edmonds Senior Researcher Institute for Research on Teaching Michigan State University	Research on School Effects and Desegregation
Dr. Barbara Jackson Dean, School of Education Morgan State University	Research on Status of Black Women in Educational Administration nd Urban School Desegregation

Visiting Scholars

1980-81 Winter Quarter	Research Topics
Dr. Robert Hill Senior Researcher Bureau of Social Science Research Washington, D.C.	Educational Research for Blacks
Dr. Kenneth Tollett Director, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy Howard University	Establishment of a Research Environment on a Black Campus
Dr. Asa Hilliard Callaway Professor of the Department of Educational Foundations Georgia State University	Research on Black Education
1980-81 Spring Quarter	
Dr. Luis Laosa Senior Researcher Educational Testing Service	Factors Which Have a Negative Effect Upon School Achievement of Students from Minority Backgrounds
1981-82 Fall Quarter	
Dr. Howard Taylor Department of Sociology Princeton University	Research on Small Group Processes and the I.Q. Heritability Controversy
Dr. Curtis Banks Senior Researcher Educational Testing Service	Research on Black Children's Personality and Recent Research Implications
1981-82 Winter Quarter	
Dr. Jacquelynne Parsons Department of Psychology University of Michigan	Research on Sex Differences in the Teaching and Learning of Mathematics During Elementary and Junior High School
1981-82 Spring Quarter	
Dr. Eugene Garcia Director, Bilingual/Bicultural Center Arizona State University	Research on Bilingualism in Young Children
Dr. Andrew Billingsley President, Morgan State University	Research on the Black Family

Computer Applications Consultant

Dr. Joe Byers — 209 Erickson Hall, M.S.U.
East Lansing, MI 48824

Information and Editorial Assistants

Dave Bolig — 133 Erickson Hall, M.S.U.
East Lansing, MI 48824

Janet Eaton — 216 Erickson Hall, M.S.U.
East Lansing, MI 48824

Pat Nischan — 216 Erickson Hall, M.S.U.
East Lansing, MI 48824

NIE Project Officer

Dr. Claiborne Richardson

Institute for Research on Teaching

Co-Directors - Dr. Jere Brophy
Dr. Andrew Porter

Associate Directors - Dr. Judith Lanier
Dr. Richard Prawat